

SMILE MORE:  
A SUBCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE  
ANCHOR/CONSULTANT RELATIONSHIP  
IN LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS OPERATIONS

---

A Thesis  
Presented to  
The School of Graduate Studies  
Drake University

---

In Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

---

by  
Mary Angela Bock  
May, 1986

1986  
.B631

SMILE MORE:  
A SUBCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE  
ANCHOR/CONSULTANT RELATIONSHIP  
IN LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS OPERATIONS

An Abstract of a Thesis by  
Mary Angela Bock  
May, 1986  
Drake University  
Adviser: Michael Cheney

The problem

Few television stations in the United States remain untouched by the influence of news consultants. To become a news anchor for a local television station, a journalist is likely to receive specialized training from these consultants. The author will analyze the relationship between anchors and consultants within the framework of an occupational subculture to better understand that relationship.

Procedure

The author uses qualitative research to explore the situation described; specifically, a series of structured interviews with randomly chosen American television news anchors and several representative consultants. Contents of the interviews are analyzed within an occupational subculture paradigm.

Findings

As subcultural outsiders, station consultants can cause irritation and anxiety for news anchors, but the skills they teach are valued by the modern television industry. Some anchors may be willing to compromise traditional news culture values to survive in their careers, but this compromise may be offset by new perceptions of their social responsibility.

Conclusion

While the skills taught by a consultant may be valued within the television news subculture, his or her role as an outsider can contribute negatively to the subculture. The hypothesis drawn from qualitative analysis is as follows: If journalistic norms constitute a strong subculture, then those who receive coaching from within the subculture will report a more positive experience than those who are coached by consultants.

Recommendations

Quantitative research can now be pursued to test the preceding hypothesis.

Locker

539562

SMILE MORE:  
A SUBCULTURAL ANALYSIS OF THE  
ANCHOR/CONSULTANT RELATIONSHIP  
IN LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS OPERATIONS

by  
Mary Angela Bock

Approved by Committee:

Michael R. Cheney  
Chair

John W. Lytle  
Susan Ellwright

W. Russell Abel  
Dean of the School of Graduate Studies

..got the bubble-headed bleach blonde,  
comes on at five.  
She can tell you 'bout the plane crash  
with a gleam in her eye.

Don Henley



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

## Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION .....	1
II. THE JOURNALISTIC SUBCULTURE.....	7
III. CHANGES IN THE SUBCULTURE.....	34
IV. METHODOLOGY.....	82
V. RESULTS.....	98
VI. CONCLUSION.....	163
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	175
APPENDIX A; SURVEY SAMPLE.....	187
APPENDIX B; STRUCTURED INTERVIEW.....	200
APPENDIX C; EXAMPLES OF CORRESPONDENCE.....	203

## LIST OF TABLES

1. RTNDA Salary Survey, 1984.....	41
2. Education.....	100
3. Years in television.....	101
4. Years anchoring.....	102
5. Breakdown by sex.....	103
6. Job experience.....	103
7. Answers to Question: "Have you ever been promoted as a 'personality?'".....	105
8. Answers to Question: "How do those promotions make you feel?".....	105
9. Answers to Question: "How would you describe the ideal anchor-viewer relationship?".....	110
10. Answers to Question: "What would you like to tell the audience?".....	112
11. Answers to Question: "What do you think of the Christine Craft case?".....	115
12. Anchors' contact with consultants.....	121
13. Anchors' impressions of their contact with consultants.....	122
14. Answers to Question: "What is a consultant's proper role in television news?".....	123

15. Breakdown of Anchors who've been coached by subcultural "insiders".....	127
16. Answers to Question: "How Important is appearance to your job?".....	131
17. Answers to Question: "How much do you worry about your appearance?".....	131
18. Anchors' impressions of the impact their appearance has had on their careers.....	132
19. Answers to Question: "Can anchors be themselves?".....	136
20. Breakdown of anchors who believe they are themselves on the air.....	136
21. Anchors' job satisfaction.....	141
22. What anchors would like to change about their jobs.....	142
23. Changes in anchors' attitudes.....	144
24. Anchors' breakdown of the job: news versus show business.....	150

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

A Midwestern anchor for the five o'clock news is looking for work. His boss has informed him that he has everything the station wants: a good delivery, good looks, fine writing ability; everything except "good research."

Christine Craft, on the lecture circuit in Des Moines, has a strong, almost abrasive speaking style. An older man stands during the question and answer period to tell her he doesn't think she's a "dog" at all; that really, she's rather attractive. Her face softens for the first time that evening when she thanks him.

An Indiana anchor cringes every time she hears one of the station's promotional ads about her. "Susan has a heart," they say, and although she believes it's true, that's not how she wants to be publicized.

It's not uncommon for a professional to serve more than one interest. Doctors, for instance, must answer to their patients, a hospital, and the American Medical Association. Lawyers are expected to defend their clients zealously,

answer to the Bar Association and obey the law. News anchors who work for commercial television stations are no exception. Their many masters include station management, the audience, editors and frequently, a relative newcomer, the television news consultant.

The use of consultants is common in nearly every industry, as an outside eye valuable for providing fresh insights, new ideas and an objective point of view[1]. But usually, a consultant shares the same goal as the client: to sell more furniture, for instance, or to better serve customers. News anchors and stations consultants do not always share the same goals. In some ways, their primary goals conflict: the consultant is hired to help station owners make money, while journalists are expected to deliver the news. The relationship between television anchors and station consultants, therefore, is worthy of attention because the different sets of values and perspectives held by its participants potentially affect the information delivered to the mass audience.

Christine Craft made national headlines with her complaints about the presence of station consultants in the television news industry[2]. She is not alone in her complaints[3]. For years, critics, news directors and other television journalists have criticized the business for

paying more attention to cosmetics than to substance. Consultants, considered experts in the cosmetics of news, are a popular target of these criticisms. These criticisms, often seen as conflicts, can be better understood by examining the occupational perspectives of television news journalists.

Within the sociology, "occupational perspectives" can be considered components of a subculture. A good working definition of subculture comes from sociologists Donald Light and Suzanne Keller: "a group whose perspective and lifestyle are significantly different from those of the cultural mainstream, and who define themselves as different; members share norms, attitudes and values"[4]. Howard Becker, who wrote a definitive study of the subculture shared by medical students, used the term "group perspectives" to help describe subcultural values and asserts that an occupational situation such as a newsroom helps create these perspectives[5].

Sociologists Light and Keller define a role as a set of "expected behavior patterns, obligations and privileges that are attached to a particular status" with status being "a position in the social structure that determines where a person fits into the community and how he or she is expected to relate to others and to act"[6]. American television

news anchors play a role in the journalistic subculture; consultants play a role new to American journalists. Understanding these roles can help in analyzing their relationship.

American television journalism enjoys constitutional protections, interpreted within the theory that a free press will ensure that the electorate will be well-enough informed to function as a democracy[7]. American journalism has traditional values that hold it responsible to the public's right to know what is going on in the world. This responsibility is bound with an idealistic veneration for truth, fairness and openness. As it is practiced in television, however, American journalism is taking on new forms. It is quite possible that these new forms; live video reports, for example, taking the place of the printed page, or highly personalized explanations of a tragedy as told by an anchor, may alter the way this responsibility is interpreted. Because of the directives granted to it by the constitution; because the television news audience is so very large; and because so many Americans depend on television as their primary news source, the institution's inner workings can hardly have too much scholarly attention.

This paper will explore some of the changes that have occurred in the journalistic subculture, and the way the anchors perceive the impact of these changes on their own roles. Specifically, this thesis concentrates on the following question:

How do television news anchors  
perceive their role as journalists  
within their occupational subculture as  
it is influenced by the presence of  
station consultants?

Focused interviews on the preceding question were performed with news anchors, randomly chosen from stations all over the United States. To better understand the subcultural perspectives of television consultants, the author also studied the work of some prominent American station consultants.



## ENDNOTES

1. Betty Holcomb, "Cooperating with the Consultants: Is It Naive to be Candid?" Savvy, March 1984, p. 61.
2. Personal interview with Christine Craft, Des Moines Iowa, 8 February 1984.
3. Ron Powers, The Newscasters (New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977), pp. 198-99.
4. Donald Light and Suzanne Keller, Sociology (New York: Alfred Knopf, 1975), p. 105.
5. Howard Becker et al., Boys in White: Student Culture in Medical School (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 36.
6. Light and Keller, p. 74.
7. Fred Siebert, Theodore Peterson, and Wilbur Schramm, Four Theories of the Press (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956), p. 7.

## CHAPTER II

### THE JOURNALISTIC SUBCULTURE

In this thesis, the traditional journalistic subculture shared by television anchors, and changes within that subculture, will be examined. The use of station consultants in television news represents one of the more significant changes that have occurred within the traditional subculture.

The traditional journalistic subculture to be described in this section has its roots in print journalism, and its heritage is shared by journalists in broadcast media[1]. Those in all media who strongly adhere to this subculture can be called "traditionalists" or "purists" and their point of view can help in understanding conflicts that may arise between television anchors and station consultants.

Scholars such as Leon Sigal[2] have used the subcultural perspective to examine not only how journalists work day to day but also the final messages produced within this subculture[3]. In support of the subcultural perspective, scholars point out that journalists do not work alone[4]. They spend long hours with their peers in the

newsroom or they travel in "packs," so their system of shared values is reinforced with time[5]. "They, [journalists] are not any more cynical or skeptical than ordinary American farmers, workers or other taxpayers," writes critic Michael Novack, but they "identify with different objects of reverence...exhibit a different cognitive style...and nourish a different vision of the nation's past"[6]. Press critics often blame this group perspective for perceived faults in the news product. That is, journalistic group perspectives are considered to be so strong that they actually define the news[7].

One observer writes, "Much more than we realize, becoming a journalist means entering into quite a special form of culture...an outsider discerns a spirit of fraternity, a world as intact as 'the clerical world,' or the 'academic world'"[8]. One of the most thorough sociological studies of journalists available found that identifying potential journalists is difficult, as they come from a variety of backgrounds, educational levels, and income levels. They acquire group perspectives that form their identity upon entering the field[9].

Many statistics are available to outline the demographic characteristics of journalists as a group. Johnstone et al. found in The News People that journalists

who had college degrees held them in everything from English to political science or history. Some enter the field as teenagers, others start late, after spending years in other occupations[10]. As the The News People concludes, "Very few other occupations in our society, and particularly those generally considered professions, are characterized by such pronounced extremes"[11].

In 1976, the year The News People was published, men outnumbered women in the profession four to one, when the national workforce ratio was two to one[12]. Blacks and other racial minorities are also underrepresented[13]. There are a number of minority news anchors and reporters in highly visible positions, but even with affirmative action, their numbers are smaller than the national average within other major industries[14]. Easily measured demographic considerations such as these, while profiling the professionals in journalism, do not go far in providing a meaningful understanding of the journalistic subculture[15].

A recent analysis of subcultures in the workplace, Corporate Cultures, by Deal and Kennedy, provides a valuable framework for analyzing the subculture of television news[16]. The authors consider the following to be elements of the workplace subculture: the business environment, heroes, the cultural network, rites and rituals, and

values[17]. The "business environment" includes the type and degree of competition present for subculture members, and the nature of the atmosphere outside the subculture; "heroes" are group role models; the "cultural network" is the method by which subcultural elements are passed from one member to the other; "rites and rituals" include specific activities shared by members of the subculture; and "values" are the ideals held by group members. Deal and Kennedy's book applied these subcultural elements to business corporations. In this thesis, the framework will be applied to the journalistic subculture. The following description of the journalistic subculture is organized according to these five elements.

### The Environment

The subcultural environment has been defined as type and degree of competition present for subculture members and the nature of the atmosphere outside of the subculture. Intense competition within the group, coupled with a suspicious attitude toward many of those outside the subculture, have helped give the traditional newsroom a highly organized bureaucratic atmosphere, with reporters and editors playing well-defined roles[18].

Journalists who do the most fact-gathering work outside the office are sometimes referred to as the "front-line" workers. They are expected to accept assignments without complaint; in times of breaking news they may be sent out without being told precisely what's going on (this happens especially if the reporters are electronically paged, or dispatched by way of two-way radio), and the "best" reporters do not question their assignments, they obey. In the words of one text for beginning reporters, "If a story is worth assigning, it's worth trying to get"[19].

Part of the highly disciplined environment can be attributed to heavy competition in the business. News organizations compete against one another; stations against other stations; newspapers against television; television against radio. The legacy of the muckraking era at the turn of the century intensified another sort of competition: journalists against the government and big business. This distrust of institutions originated has roots in the populist attitudes prevalent during this era and remains today[20]. Traditionally, journalists are expected to look out for the little guy, and to harbor at least a little suspicion of everyone, especially those with wealth and power[21].

The competitive atmosphere has fostered a strict system of rank in both print and broadcast newsrooms. Senior reporters get the choice stories, those with less experience and age must attend often to more trivial topics. General assignment reporters, like soldiers on the front line, are under the strongest control by editors[22] yet have potential for glory by "scooping" the competition.

Leon Sigal has theorized that journalists are more unified within their own subculture because of the competitive environment[23]. Rather than diffuse the enthusiasm with which journalists approach their work, a challenging environment apparently serves instead to make the subculture more viable. Other elements of the subculture, then, take on greater importance because of this viability.

### Heroes

A subculture's heroes can be thought of as group role models. To emulate the qualities of a subcultural hero is to become better accepted as a member of the group. There are many heroes in journalistic folklore, for example, Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Day and Joseph Pulitzer[24]. In the 20th Century, there are several individuals admired by

newspaper, radio and television journalists, and whose qualities, therefore, are relevant to a discussion of television anchors.

Both print and broadcast journalists admire subculture hero Edward R. Murrow. He earned his reputation while working at CBS, where he lead a small, elite group within the corporation[25]. The group was extremely proud of its accomplishments, and held dearly to the values of traditional journalism. They were "Murrow's Boys," and they had strong views about what constituted news and what did not. Writes one biographer: "Murrow's boys were proud, and justly so, of their reputations as brave, adventurous types who dashed around in trench coats, risking their lives to cover wars"[26]. Murrow's approach to broadcast news set the standards for CBS and the entire television industry in America[27]. He favored commentary and documentaries; what might now be called investigative or activist journalism. His "See It Now" series is considered a classic example of in-depth reporting and quality production. His writing was heavily stylized, and he refused to budge on the ideals that formed his shaped his work[28]. According to Murrow biographer Alexander Kendrick:

Murrow always regarded himself as a reporter rather than an analyst, but he was more. He was a disturber of the peace and collector of injustices. Radio and television are by their very



nature ephemeral. He endowed them with a sense of permanent substance by giving them a purpose[29]

Walter Cronkite started his reputation as a journalistic hero while covering the second World War for United Press International. His wire service experience was admired by many subculture traditionalists[30]. When he started anchoring for CBS in 1962, no one realized his paternalistic delivery style would eventually set the standards for an era[31]. After his retirement in 1980, his wife Betsy told an interviewer, "Walter really cares about the news. He literally grew up on it, you know. He didn't even finish college because of it. He left the University of Texas to take a job as a cub reporter in Houston"[32].

In that same interview, Cronkite underscored his traditional views: "I miss not being part of the news every night -- the clicking teletypes and the clacking typewriters. But I don't miss the on-air part at all. Actually. I've always thought that the anchorperson personality cult thing was awful"[33].

Murrow and Cronkite set the standards for network anchors. Their legacy has been cited as one of the reasons insiders believe Dan Rather decided to stay with CBS, during a time when he was courted by both NBC and ABC for a national nightly anchor position. As one ABC executive put

it: "You live in a church called CBS. You go from deacon, to bishop to cardinal. How are you going to turn down Pope?" [34].

Rather, as the current news leader of CBS, considers himself a loyal member of the journalistic subculture. His autobiography, for instance, is replete with "old war stories" of reporter stake-outs for politicians; combat coverage in Vietnam; adventures during the race riots of the sixties[35]. One of his favorite anecdotes illustrates the "tough" qualities favored within the journalistic subculture. In his story, Rather dropped his make-up compact while boarding a plane. The stewardess picked it up from where it fell, right at his feet, and wondered out loud whose compact it could possibly be. An embarrassed Rather innocently shrugged, and, in spite of the fact that he was going on the air immediately after his flight, walked off the plane without his make-up[36].

The traditional journalistic subculture hero could be called "a reporter's reporter," or a "journalist with a capital 'J'." According to the subcultural folklore, these individuals are rugged, individualistic adventurers who place the story's importance above comfort, ego gratification, even safety. They play "hardball" with the people they interview, unafraid to ask the tough question.

As Murrow, Cronkite and Rather exemplify, a journalistic hero can't be bothered with make-up or costuming. They and other men: David Brinkley, John Chancellor and Mike Wallace, for example, have influenced the way members of the subculture conduct themselves on the job. Generation after generation of reporters read their biographies, and conduct themselves accordingly.

### The Cultural Network

The subcultural network, or the manner in which subcultural values are passed on from one member to another, can be thought of as an occupation's socialization process. In traditional journalistic subculture, the socialization process for group members takes place within the group. As in any group, normative behavior is rewarded by acceptance, and deviance is punished through sanctions understood by group members[37]. That is, to become a "journalist with a capital-J," an individual must meet the standards of other group members; there is no licensing board or system of formal certification for reporters.

The subcultural wisdom of a newsroom is handed down no differently than in other occupations. There is a strong emphasis on the wisdom of the "elders:" young journalists learn from editors and older reporters. Newcomers are

called "cub reporters," and subculture hero biographies almost always mention one or two mentors who helped the youngsters along the way.

Rather's mentor, for example, was his college professor, Hugh Cunningham, who left him with the advice, "Don't let the bastards scare you"[38]. Geraldo Rivera told Ron Powers that his colleagues in the newsroom, the photographers, helped him learn the ropes[39]. Jessica Savitch had similar war stories[40]. As in other occupations, newcomers to journalism are sometimes told to forget what they've learned in school and start working in the real world[41]. A fussy, hard-nosed editor becomes the newsroom teacher, alternately feared and admired in his or her parental role.

A college education has become another important part of the indoctrination of journalists. Johnstone et al. found that a bachelor's degree is now a standard for employment, even though the journalists interviewed for The News People could not agree on what sort of B.A. is necessary[42]. The Johnstone study found that television journalists were among the strongest advocates of a college degree, perhaps because of the medium's technical considerations[43]. While a college education may have seem superfluous to the practical rigors of journalism and the

ideal journalist's rugged image, journalism texts have absorbed subcultural teachings, encouraging students to gain practical field experience, and preaching the importance of toughness and courage[44]. Indeed, it is possible to be accepted into the subculture without a college education, as long as one possesses the basic skills and qualities required of journalists[45].

Both in and out of the newsroom, "good" reporters are part of a team; in a manner of speaking, one of the boys[46]. The group goal, that of delivering the news, supercedes ego gratification. As Dan Rather's professor Cunningham told his student, "Nobody gives a s--- about you. You are not the story"[47]. Even the highest paid anchors talk about how unimportant he or she is as an individual, and say that teamwork is the key[48]. An emphasis on teamwork and esprit de corps leads to close friendships, even marriages, among working journalists. In fact, some journalists say they cannot imagine marrying someone outside the occupation, because outsiders could not possibly understand them[49].

The in-house socialization of journalists serves to strengthen the viability of the subculture. The tightly-knit news teams that form within the larger occupational subculture give their members a feeling a

self-worth[50]. This sort of mutual acceptance creates a fraternal or family atmosphere in traditional journalistic subculture, rewarding members who conform to the group's norms and values; ostracizing those who do not.

### Rites and Rituals

To be socialized into the journalistic subculture, members must participate in certain group activities, or rituals, and work their way through the rites of passage. A traditional journalist's ritualistic behavior may include maintaining a casual appearance and demeanor. The "reporter's reporter" emulates the detective Columbo's mannerisms as well as his clothing, maintaining an informal, friendly relationship with sources; making small talk over a cup of coffee[51]. Along this line of thinking, the best reporters blend into the background and take notes. They are determined to get the story, but do not call attention to themselves.

Group bonds are strengthened by a great deal of drinking and socializing after hours[52]. Interactions between group members are informal, but "tough." Coworkers are often called by their last names, and conversation is direct and frequently impersonal. Reporters are encouraged to be aggressive on assignment[53]. While they may

occasionally alienate a source, or even the public, they become more accepted within news culture.

Barbara Walters was not accepted into the journalistic subculture, apparently because she did not adhere to the traditional values: she did not try to be "one of the boys." For instance, when traveling through China with the rest of the network press corps, for example, Walters took advantage of the extra amenities a network power position provides, such as a private hotel room. Several disgruntled, less fortunate male reporters were left to sleep in the hall, and resented every minute of it[54]. The journalistic subculture's rituals have somewhat "macho" overtones. As Barbara Matusow explains:

...in television, reporters are not thought to have 'paid their dues' unless they have spent long years in the field, trudging through rain and snow, covering natural disasters, or enduring endless "stakeouts" in front of courthouses or embassies. These are unpleasant, exhausting, dirty assignments, performed for years almost exclusively by men -- and any reporter who has not done enough of them is unlikely to be regarded as a card-carrying journalist by other members of the profession. Surviving these rigors is no real proof of editorial ability, but the tradition persists[55].

Av Westin, a former executive producer for ABC, underscores this "macho" theme when he writes, "Every correspondent and producer who has made his or her mark," he asserts, "has gone through some kind of war or riot coverage"[56]. This emphasis on "machismo" helps explain why subculture traditionalists prefer their appearances to be rugged. As one looks through historical pictures of journalists, it becomes apparent that reporters used to reinforce their identity with wide-brimmed fedoras and rumpled overcoats. In the newsroom, loosened ties, rolled up shirtsleeves, and unbuttoned vests seem to mark serious newsmen of the "Front Page" era[57]. Some of these clothing symbols remain for television reporters as well. The modern uniform would be incomplete without a trench coat outdoors. When journalists are pictured at work in the newsroom, frequently they are shown without jackets or vests, even though these articles are a must for anchors on the set[58]. Clothes that say their wearer is busy or hard at work convey to the public that the journalist puts a story above looking good.

Dan Rather tells a story of trying to explain this ethic to his wife in The Camera Never Blinks[59]. She wanted him to buy a new pair of dress shoes for work, pointing out that the pair he'd been wearing had holes in the soles. He told her that any reporter who didn't have



holes in his shoes probably spent "too much time with his feet on a desk." (He did, however, eventually buy a new pair of Florsheims)[60].

Other examples of the "macho" factor include David Brinkley, who as late as 1976 refused to wear make-up on the air[61]. Peter Jennings' first shot at a national anchoring position in 1964 was considered "a disaster...everyone thought him 'too pretty'"[62]. The late Jessica Savitch went into her first job trying to act and look masculine: "The day I auditioned I pulled my hair back, wore a severely tailored blue suit and gave my best male imitation for the camera"[63]. For many traditionalists, it didn't matter how tough she tried to be, though. Putting a woman on the set was seen as a betrayal to the subculture[64].

To be accepted into the traditional journalistic subculture, male or female reporters alike are expected to be tough, rugged, and masculine. Those reporters who have worked under severe deadline pressure, survived war coverage or worked crime scene stakeouts are accepted more readily into the group. While as Matusow points out, these rituals may not necessarily make an individual a better writer or editor, they are an important part of becoming a member of the group.

### Values

A subculture's values can be thought of as a religion; that which gives its members a *raison d'etre*[65]. Traditional ethics comprise a compelling religion; one that gives journalists a sense of purpose and responsibility. According to communications scholar John Merrill, ethics lead a journalist to "seek the summum bonum, the highest good in journalism, thereby heightening his authenticity as a person and as a journalist"[66]. The ethical framework is part of a journalist's occupational identity, and legitimizes his or her work in society. "As a group, reporters have never really formalized their ethics," writes one critic, "yet I think the best of them have always followed the strictest code of ethics, a code which would compare with what the medical or legal professions have established"[67].

At the base of the journalist's ethical framework is an uncompromising idolatry of the "truth." Many ethical arguments heard among reporters deal with the troublesome task of defining "truth." While the concept of universal truth is no more accepted by journalists than by any other group of mortals, great value is placed on life's little truths; individual observations of "the facts."

In their search for a larger "truth," traditional journalists often rely on John Milton's concept of the "marketplace of ideas"[68]. The First Amendment has roots in this concept, granting journalists "freedom of the press," in order that democracy may be better served[69]. In the words of Gilmore and Root, "The grant of freedom to editors to purvey the news necessary to a democratic society carries the implied demand that they will print the news." In simpler terms, the traditional mandate for American journalists is that they show respect for their fellow man through honesty. Searching for the truth, whether with a capital or a small "t," and sharing that truth with the public, gives journalists the sense that they are doing an honorable task.

Two widely held theories influence arguments about the role of the press in American society, and the resultant ethical responsibilities[70]. Those who adhere to the libertarian theory assert that the press should have complete freedom; that a Miltonian marketplace of information operates like any other free market in a capitalistic economy. A variety of views and opinions is allowed to exist, and the "best" ones predominate in the end when they are chosen by consumers. The libertarian theory includes the assumption that there are unlimited outlets for ideas, and it is favored by many journalists, as well as a few

scholars and lawyers.

Broadcast entities, however, do not operate within a libertarian legal structure in the United States. Because there are a limited number of radio frequencies in the universe, the Federal government has deemed it constitutional and necessary to regulate the programming of radio and television more stringently than that of other media[71]. The social responsibility theory of the press, therefore, is probably favored more by modern broadcast journalists. Under social responsibility theory, the press is given a number of freedoms, but must fulfill certain responsibilities in return. The main responsibility in a democracy is to provide the electorate with adequate information for maintaining the society. Under social responsibility theory, a television outlet would be expected to provide the audience with information it needs, with less emphasis placed on what the audience wants. A democratic society needs, for instance, information about elections, government activity, weather conditions; anything that affects the population[72].

Both the libertarian and social responsibility schools preach to journalists that they must give the public the truth; be it their own personal truth, or a larger, more objective empirical truth. Essayists Gilmore and Post broke

down the concept of journalistic truth into three parts: accuracy, objectivity, and fairness[73]. These ideals, they said, cannot be sacrificed for practicality's sake[74]. The truth, in their minds, is the news, and it's the journalist's duty to deliver that news. In these writings, the "news" becomes synonymous with "truth." That which is opinion, conjecture or decorative is not the "truth" and therefore has no place in the "news."

Some scholars consider speed a journalistic value[75]. The dimension of time has become more important in electronic media, where there are more frequent deadlines. In the case of radio, there are deadlines every hour or even half-hour. With breaking news, for radio and television, there may be very little preparation time. When a reporter yells to a co-worker "I can't talk right now, I'm on deadline," the co-worker just walks away; an outsider would find the reporter's manner brusque, even rude. But except in cases of threatening, breaking news, accuracy, i.e. the truth, is valued more by the public than speed. The average viewer most likely does not care if Station A got a story on the air five minutes before Station B, as long as the information is correct. (The insiders at Station A, however, will feel triumphant. Beating the competition on time is often called "getting a scoop, or "scoring a beat"[76].)

While Gilmore and Post imply that both objectivity and fairness were achievable and separable, many journalists believe they are, to a great extent, intertwined. The whole "truth" discussion surfaces again, for in order to be objective, one must believe a universal truth exists somewhere in the cosmos waiting to be discovered. On a practical level, a number of reporters say they simply strive to be fair, and on a day to day level, objectivity is operationally defined as giving all sides of the story. Few working journalists will claim they've presented a final, empirical "truth," but they'll fight to the death over the credibility of their facts.

The common thread among the arguments over truth and fairness is the journalist's sense of duty to the audience. The truth, however defined, is something the journalist owes the public. The same goes for fairness, speed and accuracy. The resulting phenomenon of all this metaphysical debate seems rather simple: a reporter must maintain credibility by being honest. In the end, a good reporter in the traditional sense, is honest, forthright, and has integrity. Such high ideals give meaning to the work journalists perform as a group. Whether they subscribe to the libertarian or social responsibility theory of the press, journalists are able to believe their work is necessary for the rest of society. These ideals are what help many

traditional reporters justify the rituals they perform as members of the journalistic subculture.

### Summary

This section has examined five elements of the journalistic subculture: the environment, rites and rituals, heroes, the cultural network, and values. These elements have been described as having overtones of masculinity, a distrust for institutions such as big business and government, and an overriding sense of responsibility to the public. As tenacious as the elements of journalistic subculture may be[77], conditions for television anchors are forcing some philosophical changes. The introduction of consultants to newsrooms is part of these changing conditions. But because the subcultural transformation is incomplete, there are conflicts between self-proclaimed traditionalists those who often call themselves "realists"[78]. This conflict, a collision between old and new, is manifest on an individual level in the sometimes rocky, sometimes harmonious relationship between anchors and consultants.

## ENDNOTES

1. Barbara Matusow, The Evening Stars: The Making of A Network News Anchor (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983), p 101.

2. Leon V. Sigal, Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking, (Lexington, Mass: D.C. Heath, 1973).

3. Gary Thompson, "Craft Sees 'Illusion' in TV News Business," The Times Delphic (Des Moines: Drake University), 14 February 1984, p. 1

4. Sigal, p. 4.

5. Barbara E. Phillips, "Novelty without Change," Journal of Communication, Autumn 1976, p. 111.

6. Michael Novack, "The People and the News," Moments of Truth, ed. Marvin Barrett (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973), p. 189.

7. Phillips, p. 111.

8. Michael Novack, "Notes on the Drama of Politics and the Drama of Journalism," In The Politics of Broadcasting, ed. Marvin Barrett (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1972), p. 171.

9. John W. C. Johnstone, Edward J. Slawski, and William Bowman, The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976), pp. 37-49.

10. The interviews performed for this paper revealed equally varied backgrounds.

11. Johnstone et al., p. 31.

12. Ibid., p. 22.

13. Dwight Ellis, "A Review/Preview of Blacks' Uphill Climb for Parity in Television," Variety, 29 September 1982, p. 1.



14. Edwin Diamond, The Tin Kazoo: Television, Politics and the News (Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1975), p. 161.

15. Raymond Gordon, Interviewing: Strategies, Techniques and Tactics (Homewood, Ill.: The Dorsey Press, 1969), p. 15.

16. Terrance Deal and Allan Kennedy, Corporate Cultures: The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life (Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1982).

17. Ibid., pp. 13-15.

18. Sigal, p. 71.

19. Irving Fang, Television News, Radio News, 3rd ed., rev. (St. Paul: Rada Press, 1980), p. 139.

20. Sigal, p. 88.

21. Melvin Mencher, News Reporting and Writing, 2nd ed. (Dubuque, Ia.: Wm. C. Brown Publishers, 1977), pp. 19-20.

22. Sigal, p. 111.

23. Ibid., p. 88.

24. Edwin Emery, The Press and America, 2nd ed., (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1962).

25. Matusow, The Evening Stars, pp. 49-50.

26. Ibid.

27. Ibid., p. 47.

28. Alexander Kendrick, Prime Time: The Life and Times of Edward R. Murrow (New York: Avon Books, 1969), p. 17.

29. Ibid.

30. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 131.

31. Cronkite's style is still emulated and admired by many local anchors, including a few of those interviewed for this paper.

32. Cleveland Amory, "What Walter Cronkite Misses Most," Parade Magazine, 11 March 1984, p. 5.
33. Ibid.
34. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 44.
35. Dan Rather and Mickey Herskowitz, The Camera Never Blinks: Adventures of A TV Journalist (New York: Ballantine Books, 1977).
36. Ibid., p. 65.
37. Sanford Labowitz, An Introduction to Sociological Concepts (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977), p. 9.
38. Rather and Herskowitz, p. 98.
39. Powers, 188.
40. Jessica Savitch, Anchorwoman (New York: G.P. Putnam and Sons, 1982).
41. Herbert Brucker, Journalist: Eyewitness to History (London: MacMillan 1962), p. 132.
42. Johnstone et al., pp. 32-44.
43. Ibid., p. 32.
44. Mencher, pp. 19-20.
45. Johnstone et al., p. 47.
46. Av Westin, Newswatch: How T.V. Decides the News (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982), p. 54.
47. Rather and Herskowitz, p. 308.
48. Telephone Interview, Des Moines, Iowa, with Larry Hunter, 21 January 1985.
49. Susan Page, "'Til Deadline Do Us Part," Washington Journalism Review, March 1985, pp. 45-48.
50. Dexter Dunphy, The Primary Group: A Handbook for Analysis and Field Research (New York: Meredith Corporation, 1972), pp. 286-87.

51. Ken Metzler, Creative Interviewing: The Writer's Guide to Gathering Information by Asking Questions (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977), p. 80.

52. Ronald Caspar and Florence Hughes, "So-Called Heavy-Drinking Occupations: Two Empirical Tests," Journal of Studies on Alcohol, January 1982, pp. 110-18.

53. Mencher, pp. 19-20.

54. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 177.

55. Ibid., pp. 171-72.

56. Westin, p. 117

57. Matusow, The Evening Stars.

58. Alison Lurie, The Language of Clothes (New York: Random House, 1983), p. 111.

59. Rather and Herskowitz.

60. Ibid., p. 248.

61. Matusow, p. 204.

62. Ibid., p 142.

63. Savitch, p. 89.

64. Powers, p. 168.

65. Sigal, pp. 88-93.

66. John C. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney, eds. Ethics and the Press (New York: Hastings House, 1978), p. 8.

67. Gabe Pressman, Robert Lewis Shayon, and Robert Schulman, "Ethics in Television Journalism," in Ethics and the Press, ed. John C. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney (New York: Hastings House, 1978), p. 236.

68. Gene Gilmore and Robert Root, "Ethics for Newsmen," in Ethics and the Press, John C. Merrill, and Ralph D. Barney, eds. (New York: Hastings House, 1978), p. 27.

69. Siebert, Peterson, and Schramm.
70. Ibid.
71. William Francois, Mass Media Law and Regulation, 3rd ed. (Columbus, Ohio: Grid Publishing, 1982), p. 533.
72. Siebert, Peterson and Schramm.
73. Gilmore and Root, pp. 28-30.
74. Ibid.
75. Pressman, Shayon, and Schulman, p. 236.
76. Sigal, p. 71.
77. Ibid., p. 90
78. In the course of this study, interview subjects would outwardly call themselves cynics, or say that to accept unfairness is necessary for survival in the broadcasting business.

## CHAPTER III

### CHANGES IN THE SUBCULTURE

The journalistic subculture, as experienced by television news anchors, started to change in the early sixties. By 1962, Walter Cronkite had been named anchor for CBS news[1], Frank Magid started doing television audience research at his firm in Marion, Iowa[2], and broadcasting hero Edward R. Murrow had bid an angry farewell to CBS[3]. In this chapter, three main themes of change within the journalistic subculture will become apparent: "commercialization," a greater influence of financial considerations on television news production; "beautification," an increased emphasis on television journalists' physical appearance; and "dehumanization," the transformation of television anchors into a role as a product. These three themes of change overlap, and will be evident to varying degrees in the five elements of subculture to be discussed. These three trends are transforming the "traditional" journalistic subculture into what shall be referred to as the "modern television" subculture. What follows is an analysis of this "modern

television news" subculture according to the five elements.

### The Environment

The subcultural environment has been defined as the type and degree of competition present for subcultural members, and the nature of the atmosphere surrounding the subculture. The "modern television news" subculture is marked by intense competition among its members, and much more scrutiny from the public; those outside of the subculture.

Until the about 1960, local news was produced as a "public service," a non-profit service performed only to meet F.C.C. regulations[4]. Soon, however, station executives found that a successful newscast "carried over" viewers to other programming, thereby making the local newscast important to a station's advertising revenue. In many cases the newscast became the only program locally produced, and was, in a sense, a station's "signature"[5]. In time, one or two ratings points in the local newscast could mean hundreds of thousands of dollars in advertising revenue for a station[6].

Rich financial rewards inspired the business-advertising community to embrace local news enthusiastically. In 1970, the fifteen network owned and operated local stations took in 312 million dollars in revenue, with profits of 117 million dollars. Executives called that a "stagnant" year: the return on investment came to 37.5 percent while the average return for major oil companies at that time was around eight percent. "Indeed," remarked critic Ed Diamond, "operating a television station is more profitable than just about any other business, including network operations"[7]. Competition to enter and stay in the business became fierce. Hundreds of stations were operating in the early eighties -- more than seven hundred commercial VHF and UHF entities[8]. Turning a profit is so easy, charge some critics, that managers became lazy; they didn't know their product[9]. Television news itself is profitable for most stations today. Instead of drawing money away from other departments, the majority are turning a profit[10].

Meanwhile, television was winning more and more attention from the public. In 1950, Americans watched an average of four hours, thirty-five minutes of television a day. In 1970, the time increased to nearly six hours. The trend continued, and the average family watched an incredible seven hours of television a day[11]. Americans

have more televisions than telephones, bathtubs or toilets -- 97 percent of all households own a set; one-tenth of all households own three or more sets. In the mid-seventies, statisticians found that watching television became the most frequent human activity after sleep; ahead of working, eating, or making love[12]. This growing audience was watching local television news in between the sitcoms and variety shows. In 1965, an Elmo Roper poll found that television surpassed newspapers as the most credible medium[13]. In 1971, the pollsters were told by sixty percent of the population that they relied on television for their news[14].

As a news medium, television is apparently as credible as ever. While the public's faith in television news dipped in 1978, it regained its two-to-one lead over newspapers by 1980. More than half of those polled by the Roper Foundation said they give television more credibility than newspapers[15]. When Roper asked viewers to rate the quality of television news coverage, local news fared well: 86 percent gave local news coverage an "excellent" rating. (Although only 21 percent said television meets overall news needs excellently)[16].



The journalistic subculture enjoyed some rewards because of this "boom." Money was poured into what was once the most impoverished department in the organization. Suddenly money was available for cameras, videotape, and larger staffs[17]. But problems came with the money: a news department profit was no longer a pleasant surprise for station executives. Instead, a return on investment came to be expected. Consequently, local television news in the 1960s and '70s was compared to the journalism of Hearst and Pulitzer during their circulation wars with its emphasis on bloody, sexy or just-plain strange stories[18]. The rewards in this race, however, were ratings points, not circulation figures.

The "modern television" subcultural environment then, still fosters competition between different newsrooms. But because of the increasing television audience and heavy capital outlays, the stakes are much higher in the new competition. This competition filters down to employees as pressure. Television anchors, as competitive journalists and station representatives, are expected to deliver an audience. To do this, journalists must adopt habits and skills heretofore unnecessary in their subculture. The result? A need for consultants; professionals hired by station management to teach journalists the skills necessary for attracting and keeping an audience.

### Heroes

Traditional journalistic heroes have been described as tough, individualistic idealists who care more about the story than their own glory. They are the most loyal members of the subculture, who embody the ideals of traditional journalism. In the "modern television" subculture, however, a new kind of hero has emerged, one with a good appearance, an ability to perform, and to play the role of a star. The trade-off for these new heroes is that they are under greater control by business and advertising professionals who try to sell the news. Consider, for example, NBC President Sylvester Weaver, who once claimed he first saw Chet Huntley at a luncheon in New York in 1955, where Huntley had delivered a brief, intelligent speech. "I turned to Davidson Taylor (the vice president in charge of Public Affairs) and said, 'Get him.' Some people were afraid we might have some problems with him because of his reputation as a free-thinker, but I said 'Everybody can be controlled. Get him'"[19].

The contemporary television anchor has taken on a new role, one that blends traditional and modern behavior patterns, obligations and privileges. Traditionally, the

anchor is the leader of a broadcast news organization; the equivalent of a newspaper's top reporter or editor[20]. The modern role is the result of television news profitability. Anchors have become a product; someone to be sold, and therefore, in Weaver's words, someone to be controlled[21]. In pure materialistic terms, anchors, not reporters or even editors, are the new journalistic heroes. A 1984 study of broadcasting salaries found the average television anchor earning far more than the average reporter. In large markets, their salaries outweighed that of their boss[22][TABLE 1].

An interesting contrast between reality and public appearance occurs with the introduction of this new role. While a newscast is put together by a team, as Westin points out[23], most of whose members work behind the scenes, the public only has significant contact with the anchor. Anchors become, in a sense, a station's representatives, yet may have relatively little control over that station's business. Even the national anchors, whom Matusow asserts have too much power, are subservient to management's whims. Matusow acknowledges this subservience when she writes, "Even Walter Cronkite, who held the coveted title of managing editor of his broadcast, was always regarded as 'talent' by CBS management, which is another way of saying 'performer'"[24]. A station has to manage its "performer

product" just as it does any other product sold to the audience.

TABLE 1  
MEDIAN WEEKLY SALARIES IN TV NEWS BY MARKET

MARKET SIZE: (BY NATIONAL RANK)	1-25 ¶	26-50 ¶	50-10 ¶	101-150 ¶	151-210 ¶
STAFF, LOW	\$288 ¶	\$250 ¶	\$225 ¶	\$222 ¶	\$200 ¶
TYPICAL CAMERA	\$500 ¶	\$365 ¶	\$275 ¶	\$245 ¶	\$226 ¶
TYPICAL PRODUCER	\$538 ¶	\$425 ¶	\$350 ¶	\$300 ¶	\$289 ¶
HIGH PRODUCER	\$673 ¶	\$520 ¶	\$385 ¶	\$350 ¶	\$326 ¶
TYPICAL REPORTER	\$575 ¶	\$425 ¶	\$320 ¶	\$275 ¶	\$250 ¶
HIGH REPORTER	\$711 ¶	\$534 ¶	\$400 ¶	\$346 ¶	\$300 ¶
TYPICAL ANCHOR	\$1,002 ¶	\$870 ¶	\$500 ¶	\$400 ¶	\$326 ¶
HIGH ANCHOR	\$1,602 ¶	\$1,502 ¶	\$696 ¶	\$538 ¶	\$449 ¶
NEWS DIRECTOR	\$925 ¶	\$900 ¶	\$650 ¶	\$570 ¶	\$500 ¶

Source: Vernon Stone, "Salaries Change Little in 1984," The Communicator, February 1985. Questionnaires were sent to 725 non-satellite commercial television stations; a second mailing was sent to non-respondents, and 463 were returned. More than half provided most of the salary data requested.

As a station's symbolic representative, anchors have assumed more importance in the marketing of television news. The "star" system seems to have been born not because newsrooms wanted to honor their leaders, but because salespeople needed something to package and sell. ABC vice-president James Hagerty (who had a traditional perspective) once tried a newscast format without anchors: reporters just passed control of the show onto each other as they finished their stories. The sales department resisted. "How do you expect us to sell a show with nobody on it to sell?" they demanded[25]. ABC tried a similar system again in the mid-seventies after losing a bid for Dan Rather. Former producer Av Westin calls the system a "dance of the seven veils," which attempted to cover up the network's lack of a single star. The format ultimately failed[26].

Reporters are not the only human beings who are peddled to the American public. Politicians, for instance, are another occupational group to experience the phenomenon. Advertisers have formed a small industry to help market people who run for office[27]. Consultants who perform these marketing services, just like their television-news colleagues, deny that they change people, saying instead that they "manage" images; that they help get a message across, but don't invent the message. From a marketing standpoint, human beings truly are no different from

toothpaste or cottage cheese; they are products. Roger Mudd once said he felt like a "piece of meat"[28]. As one business writer

concludes:

Like consumer goods, these products (candidates and ideas) arouse certain sets of feelings and expectations. Feelings and expectations about politicians are not new phenomena. The methodology to explore and use them in the white heat of a high-stakes campaign, however, is very much a tool of the new technology[29].

In The Newscasters, infamous reporter Geraldo Rivera is open about the fact that he is a "product," of sorts: "(The networks) make celebrities, man," he told Powers, "...so they created me"[30]. On the day he was hired, Rivera says the general manager of WABC ignored the fact that Rivera had not ever had any formal journalistic training. "He just looked me over like I was a piece of meat, up and down"[31]. Powers comments that Rivera seems almost proud to have been hired in this dehumanizing way; Rivera knew he was more an object to his employer than a person[32].

There are alternatives to the star anchor system. In Europe, for instance, "news readers" traditionally have delivered the news[33]. This tradition is disappearing, however, as marketers in other countries discover how profitable selling a "personality" can be. Al Primo, a

former New York news director who now consults, explains the star system's importance: "If you took all the factors that go into making up a news program, and assigned a weight so that the total added up to ten, the anchor would get eight and all the other factors together would add up to two. Why do you think they pay these people so much money?"[34]

As stars, these special journalists have become performers, complete with makeup cases, talent agents and a special new qualification: charisma. Walter Cronkite, who held no punches in attacking the integrity of local anchors[35], was given six to seven minutes to be on the air at the expense, frequently, of taped stories and other correspondents. This time was known as "the magic," and was credited with the ratings success of the CBS evening news, but criticized by correspondents who felt their stories were suffering from Cronkite's dominance[36].

Ironically, this was the man who said that the difference between local news anchors and actors was only a "matter of degree"[37]. America's premier news anchor, a traditional journalism hero, was accused of having a star-sized ego: of being an air hog; and of being able to hide these facets of his personality while on the air[38]. Cronkite's successor, Dan Rather, was criticized for being dramatic at the expense of accuracy. During Rather's years

at the White House, another network reporter, upon being told to imitate Rather's style, protested, "Look, he's wrong fifty percent of the time"[39].

Physical attractiveness takes on more importance as television anchors work to meet the "charisma" qualification. Smiling becomes as much a prerequisite as being able to take good notes at a news conference. Dan Rather received letter after letter when he started anchoring for CBS, berating him for a "glum look." His response, "I am not, and never have been, a natural smiler[40]. Production assistants used to write "smile" on the TelePrompTer for Chet Huntley during his newscasts[41]. Anchors interviewed for this paper remarked that their superiors sometimes tell them simply to "smile more" while on the air.

As anchors filled the charisma qualification, critics charged that substantive qualities were being ignored. "Shamelessly exploited" local anchors were criticized for being brainless, good-looking, talking heads who merely put on a "credibility act"[42]. The image remains. Reagan Ramsey, news director of KGW in Seattle, Washington, calls anchors a bunch of "unmanageable knumbskulls." Av Westin, as executive producer for ABC News, considered his role as in-house psychologist one of his most important because



newsroom egos had become so swollen and tender[43]. Matusow remarks unhappily that matters of substance are ignored:

"It was considered a definite plus if the job went to a qualified journalist who knew how to write, but it was infinitely more important that he or she appear to be knowledgeable"[44]. Powers is even more critical when he called WLS Chicago's Joel Daly "history's first anchor-yodeler" after the station aired a promotional campaign with a country-western theme[45].

Unmanageable knumbskulls or not, anchors are a main attraction when a viewer is actively choosing a particular news program. An oft-cited New York University study found that on a list of what viewers considered when choosing a news program, the anchor was in second place. At the top of the list was the program that airs before a newscast. Local stations cannot always choose the programs leading into their news (that's up to the network) but they can control the anchor. To the chagrin of news traditionalists, the same study found only ten percent of the audience chose a newscast because of the quality of the news[46].

The ability to act or perform; to be a "personality," is unique to television journalism. Radio announcers have to use inflection in their voices; this can be considered a limited form of acting. But to combine all the elements;

voice, dress, demeanor, delivery, this is expected only of the television anchor. Network executives have only vague descriptions for it, calling the success factor of Douglas Edwards, Chet Huntley, David Brinkley and John Cameron Swayze "chemistry"[47]. When the chips were down and CBS had to choose between Dan Rather and Roger Mudd to replace Cronkite, the man with "star quality" prevailed.

Powers calls this requirement the ability to share a collective fantasy with the viewer[48]. The implication is that by creating this image, journalists are deceiving the audience somehow, a development that strikes the very heart of the traditional journalistic mandate of delivering the truth. One critic reports:

A surprising number of on-camera news people find their craft so professionally unsatisfying that they keep jumping from station to station -- or drop out altogether after a few years...the big turn-off, especially for seasoned print journalists who switch to the tube, is the discovery that the job is more show-biz than news-biz[49].

CNN anchor Chris Curle considers herself a traditionalist, and criticizes television's newcomers: "Some of the young women coming into broadcasting can't tell the difference between Wonder Woman and anchorwoman. They think of the job as being a celebrity, not as a journalist"[50]. Jessica Savitch had a similar tale. She

was speaking to a group of students at Ithaca college in New York state, and a drama student said that if she couldn't make it as an actress after graduation, she planned to be an anchor. "But they're not the same thing," Savitch explained. "No, but they're both stars," said the girl[51].

The purists' complaints against local television are profuse. Lynn Scherr, formerly of WCBS, told Newsweek of her difficulties in putting together well-researched stories: "There's a television mentality that says the only time you're working is when you're out with a camera crew"[52]. The greatest irony occurs when stations attempt to follow the traditions of the journalistic subculture by appointing their best reporters to deliver the news as anchors. This takes the best reporters off the streets, making their most valuable skills useless to the organization, and makes the anchors bored to death[53]. (This boredom was mentioned repeatedly during the course of the interviews for this study[54].)

There is an interesting contrast between what some anchors declare themselves to be, and the way they appear to outsiders. Individuals who are considered to have succeeded as stars will often profess to hold a traditional perspective, shunning their star status. For instance, network anchors like Cronkite and Rather are criticized for

being part of the star system[55], yet deny that they have anything special. "I do not think about my performance," Rather once told an interviewer, "and if I did, I wouldn't know what to think about it"[56]. Note the ironic reference to Murrow in this advice from ABC executive Boone Arledge:

One of the things I've said is that if you're going to be an anchor, a lot of it has nothing to do with news altogether -- your hair, how you dress, how you look. It's a shame, but if you're going to be in TV, that's the way it is. You have to take into consideration everything that's in the mix. People have certain expectations about how an anchor should conduct himself, and how he should look. Edward R. Murrow used to take guys to London tailors[57].

The trends toward commercialization, beautification and dehumanization have created a confusing set of demands for television anchors. The traditional role they've inherited values toughness, informality and teamwork. But in the "modern television" subculture, these same individuals are expected to be charismatic, attractive and individualistic. In many ways, the two sets of expected behaviors are in direct conflict. This odd blending of roles might be expected to create difficulties for television anchors as members of either subculture; traditional or modern.

### The Cultural Network

The increasing commercialization of television news created an opportunity for marketing strategists who could help stations meet profit goals. Television station consultants perform this function within the "modern television" subculture. Consultants who advise television journalists have become part of the subculture socialization process, or the cultural network. They are a unique part of the socialization process for the journalistic subculture, however, because they are outsiders. Unlike other members of the network, they frequently have no journalistic training[58].

Consultants are hired, essentially, to give marketing advice. They tell stations how to attract more viewers to a newscast, thereby increasing ratings, and eventually, increasing profits. At first, only stations with ratings "trouble" called consultants for help, but today, they're kept on contract to simply maintain the ratings for a station[59]. Frank Magid and Associates is the leading consulting agency in terms of the number of clients. McHugh-Hoffman is the oldest[60]. There are many others: Primo People, started by Al Primo, former News Director for New York's Channel 4; Marketing Evaluations Inc.; Entertainment Response Analysts; and Melvin A. Goldberg

Inc. of New York[61]. One estimate in the mid-seventies was that three of four television American television stations have felt the impact of a consulting agency[62]. In the Broadcasting Yearbook, there are 242 listings of agencies and individuals advertising themselves as consultants[63].

Consultants use demographic research and audience analysis techniques to determine viewer preferences, then use their findings to recommend changes in a local newscast. The recommendations can go into great detail, including how to improve set design, how much money to spend on salaries, how long stories should go, what type of stories viewers are interested in, and who should be hired and fired[64]. Magid runs a coaching operation out of its headquarters in Marion, Iowa, where anchors can go learn writing and delivery technique. The company also keeps a library of audition tapes of talent from all over the country, making it easier for news directors to "go shopping."

Some news directors resent the presence of consultants in the newsroom, saying essentially that because consultants are not part of the traditional journalistic subculture, they have no right to take any advisory powers in a newsroom[65]. Consultants deny charges that they're dictatorial when they become part of the cultural network.

According to one:

There's no formula of 'these are things you must do, these are things you mustn't do.' What we do is strive for is a greater degree of understanding. We try to achieve the best communication possible -- audio and visual -- so the viewer has less difficulty. If the viewer has to do all the work, he simply isn't going to do it. We try to put the burden for making news understandable on the presenter, not the receiver[66].

The goal seems harmless enough, but has come under tremendous criticism over the past twenty years. Reviewers accuse consultants of deceiving the public, of watering down the news, of making all newscasts look alike[67]. While many consultants deny they make recommendations about content for newscasts, critics charge that by using audience analysis techniques, changes in newscast content is unavoidable[68]. Critics point to what they consider a lack of respect for the audience, something which conflicts with the traditional journalists' role as a public servant. This memo to the staff of a San Diego station was written by a consultant, and has been criticized for lacking respect for the audience:

Remember, the vast majority of our viewers hold blue collar jobs. The vast majority of our viewers never went to college. The vast majority of our viewers have never been on an airplane. The vast majority of our viewers have never seen a copy of The New York Times. The vast majority of our viewers do not

read the same books and magazines that you read...In fact, many of them never read anything. The vast majority of the viewers in this television market currently ignore television news[69].

Critic Edwin Diamond finds memos such as this to be useless: "The consultant's basic major finding in the '70s is that people don't want their news to be dull. This information has been treated like the epochal discovery of Copernicus..."[70].

Consultants, however, point out that they are merely reporting the results of scientific research. Their findings have been supported by researchers outside the business and advertising sector. Empirical studies by academic researchers have found, for instance, that personality, appearance and a newscaster's voice influence their appeal to viewers[71]. Research has also found that audiences respond to very specific appearance cues. For instance, one study found that the viewers' ideal newscaster is white, male, clean shaven and wears a dark jacket and white shirt[72]. Another study that could potentially frustrate traditional journalists found that of all the attributes a newscaster may have, gender and physical attractiveness are the only two that make a significant difference to the audience[73].



Many journalists and critics argue not with the findings of consultant research, but its use within the subculture[74]. News directors spent much of the 1970s expressing their resentment of perceived intrusions by consultants. During the 1970s[75], a typical news director's tenure fell to two and a half years, and much of the blame was placed on station managers who had more faith in outside researchers than their own newsroom leaders. One news director complained,

In the past year, I've spoken with several news directors who are seriously considering other fields of endeavor...There aren't many major markets left where stations don't retain an outside media research and/or consulting service...which will screen your shows, critique them, tell you what you're doing wrong, suggest special features to include, etc. etc. Before too many good newsmen leave us, our managers and owners must come to grips with this very real problem[76].

Ron Powers' The Newscasters provides an invaluable analysis of local television and its relationship with consultants. Powers' book is highly critical of consultants, labeling them as "salesmen who sell to other salesmen"[77]. His primary complaint is that communication cannot be analyzed as precisely and coolly as consultants' data sheets might imply, and that by using demographics and audience analyses to deliver what people want is not populist, as consultants will frequently claim, but is

instead quite elitist. Powers accuses Frank Magid and others of dividing the world into socioeconomic layers and then pandering only to the lower layers. As he puts it, it's human nature to prefer to watch stories about houseplants over politics, but it's immoral to deliver only stories about plants[78].

Many of the complaints against consultants, come with little more than personal experience as evidence. One quantitative study of Iowa stations that retain consultants versus those that do not, found that stations with consultants did have more "people-oriented" news, more happy talk and less "high-brow" (government and economic) news than those without. But the same study found more "low-brow" content (sex, violence, prurience) broadcast by the NON-consultant stations than by the consultant-retaining stations[79]. The impact consultants have had on newscast content, therefore, is not easily categorized as positive or negative. It is apparent, however, from the criticisms of consultants publicized by members of the journalistic subculture, that consultants have had a profound impact on the way journalists work with one another.

Most of the criticisms of consultants give only cursory attention to their relationship with anchors. News directors rail about a consultant's recommendations for

hiring, firing or somehow changing on-air personnel based on their charismatic qualities. The Iowa study, for example, neglected the effect of consultants on personnel relations[80]. Consultants in the capacity of talent coaches received little attention until Christine Craft raised the issue in the early '80s. Since then, other television journalists have complained of the role-playing they see by anchors[81]. The beautification trend is evident in many of the complaints that on-air personnel are forced to fit into a mold. Renee Poussaint, of WJLA in Washington D.C. thought women especially fell victim to this phenomenon:

...I was covering the Republican convention this year, as I had done four years ago in Detroit. The tremendous difference, which dawned on me about the third day I was walking through the hallways of the broadcasting center, was that there was a certain kind of clone, a female clone, and she was between the ages of 21 and 26, and she had blond hair and was a size eight. It was as if two thousand broadcast stations had hired one of them and sent them to the Republican convention[82].

Other critics have harsher words for the men:

The women seem to have somewhat more character than the men -- there is, I believe, someplace in the world where they turn out men from some kind of cloning system...They are handsome, speak directly to you, but don't seem to have anything behind those glittering eyes[83].

Within the journalistic subcultural network, the role consultants play that directly affects television anchors is that of a talent coach. In coaching situations, consultants may advise anchors on how to dress, how to speak, how to put on makeup and how to wear their hair; lessons not part of the traditional journalism curriculum. The trend of beautification, placing importance on cosmetics as opposed to substance, seems almost dishonest to traditionalists. Yet, the consultants say the lessons are based on empirical findings about audience expectations. As clothing advisor John T. Malloy teaches:

It is an undeniable fact that the typical upper-middle class American looks white, Anglo-Saxon and Protestant. He is of medium build, fair complexion with almost no pronounced physical characteristics....Like it or not, his appearance will normally elicit a positive response from someone viewing him. Anyone not possessing his characteristics will elicit a negative response in some degree, regardless of whether that response is conscious or unconscious[84].

The introduction of consultants to the television news industry marks a significant change in traditional journalistic subculture. In the modern television subculture, outsiders are now part of the system that socializes journalists; outsiders who may or may not have any journalistic training[85]. These outsiders may be involved with decisions about who will be promoted and who

division employs about twenty full-fledged station consultants who work with the news product as a whole; three "communication specialists" who work full time coaching talent; and one appearance consultant, who gives anchors advice on clothes, hair and make-up. Ridge said although a station may only be visited by one consultant, back in Iowa at the home office, all of them may work together. Each member of the team has different areas of expertise, so the 100 or so Magid client stations really have the benefit of many consultants at once.

Magid and Associates can pick and choose its clientele. "We're not for everybody," Ridge said proudly, adding that the company doesn't advertise within the television industry; "Business comes to us." What's more, Ridge believes, more and more television professionals are apt to accept the need for a consultant, and are more realistic about what consultants can and cannot do. "Research is a given," he says "there's been an evolution...a maturing of what consultants do. There's nothing magic about it." If he is correct, the ritual of coaching, as part of consultancy, may now be a permanent element of the journalistic subculture.

Ridge says Magid is the only company that offers such a wide range of services, including both research and consultation literally under one roof. Only one station per market can contract with Magid. "We're paid to move a station forward," Ridge says, so it wouldn't make any sense for the company to compete against itself. Client contracts last from two to three years, and rates based on the level of services rendered and market size. A station can ask for market research only, and can ask for different types of studies to be done, or it can buy research and consulting services. Consulting and coaching is not available to a station, however, unless it has a research contract. That is, unless a station hires Magid to do demographic studies, consultant services are not made available. Private citizens or individual anchors or talent can contract with the consultant division for coaching sessions, as long as that person is not in a competitive position against a Magid client-station. Wilch and Hofacker say they have quite a few people come in just for the on-air coaching sessions; in fact, they've known some anchors to request a coaching session during station contract negotiations.

As vice president of the division, Ridge still works as a station consultant. He is a former television news director, and believes this helps him convince clients of his credibility. Ridge seems to anticipate the protests of

traditional journalists who say they don't want to be told what to do. He tells clients, "Hey, I used to do this," before showing them "what's been most effective" for him. He does get suspicious clients sometimes, but he's not bothered by their resistance. "If they don't take advantage of it," says Ridge, "I start asking 'Why?'"

All of Magid's 300 employees work out of Marion. Ridge says the company experimented with branch offices once, but consultants found it hard to coordinate their efforts. Half the operation is devoted to consulting, the other half to market research. The company saves all its marketing studies, but they are not available to the public; they remain the property of Magid and the individual clients. Material for these these books is organized by Magid's professional coders, who prepare data for computer analysis.

Telephone survey-takers, who gather raw data, work in the evening, when most viewers can be reached. No matter where the client station is located, research is conducted in Marion. "The phone company loves us," joked Wilch. According to Wilch, telephone surveys with open-ended questions are the primary tools for Magid's television research. Focus groups are used occasionally to back up the surveys, if requested by a client, but Wilch says focus groups are not as scientifically valid as the surveys.

### The Coaches

In studying the working relationship between television anchors and consultant coaches, the particular methods used by consultants to coach talent must be considered. Consultants are matter-of-fact about their teaching methods. Each has a different approach to their work, reflecting, perhaps, different attitudes about the people whose careers they are influencing. Magid calls anchor-students "talent," as do many television executives all over the country. Lynne Scarborough, who used to work for Audience Research and Development in Dallas and is now in business for herself[87], amused RTNDA members with her claim that this term is insulting to anchors; that they must be given "credit for many talents." She prefers the term O-C-P, or "On-Camera Presenter."

Dan Wilch and the other communication specialist at Magid studied theater in college. Department supervisor Kris Hofacker has a PhD in speech. Scarborough also has a theatrical background, and is not afraid to admit she has never worked as a journalist. Huguelet used to work for Frank Magid. Topping's been on both sides, as a consultant for McHugh Hoffman and now as a news director. Those without news experience are not defensive about what subculture traditionalists would consider a serious lack of



training. They all are sure they have knowledge that anchors need to share. Huguelet says, "Most people are flying on instruments when it comes to performance," and rely too much on instinct when it comes to communication skills. Topping describes most of his coaching clients this way: "They had developed an approach that allowed them to appear on the air without embarrassment."

Scarborough told the news directors that although they probably had experience in journalism, writing or radio skills, they probably did not know all the visual skills they needed. "We're dealing with a new medium...it has new rules," she told her audience, adding, "television is the most demanding performance medium that currently exists." She bases that claim on a feedback theory. On stage, or even when acting in a movie, the people performing get constant feedback from directors or the audience. But for television anchors, she believes, "there is a gap in the feedback loop. Nobody is responding to them."

Videotapes are an indispensable part of the coach's training process. RTNDA panelists advised news directors who wanted to do their own talent coaching to get a tape player and monitor into their office so that they could play tapes of the anchor-student and other anchors as examples. KTRK's Jim Topping, a former McHugh-Hoffman consultant,

explains that tapes allow a coach to point out specific performance problems; it's more effective to pause a tape mid-stream and say, for example, "See? that's what I mean...you bob your head too much."

Scarborough says that using a tape has the added advantage of being less-threatening to the anchor. Instead of criticizing the person, she warns, a coach must critique the behavior: what's on tape. Scarborough theorizes that the big-egos so many anchors are accused of having are merely masks for insecurities. Too many anchors, she believes, have been "emotionally ravaged" by criticism that didn't teach them how to improve, only put them down. Huguelet underscores Scarborough's caveat about tact: criticism must be done privately, not in angry spurts while an anchor's in the studio, on the air. This emphasis by consultants on an anchor's need for praise and acceptance could be interpreted two ways. They may sincerely care about "talent" as human beings; they may also consider anchors to be children, who need to be manipulated. A consultant-anchor working relationship is probably less likely to be cooperative if the anchor perceives the latter.

The coaching process in Marion is secluded and concentrated. A great deal of an anchor's two-day session with Magid takes place in a small white room that has just

enough room for a desk, video camera, tape-deck and chair. Communication specialist Dan Wilch explains that it's not intended to re-create a television news studio; it's more of a classroom. Indeed, very little of an anchors' experience with the talent coaches at Magid is intended to re-create the news environment. The building seems calm and quiet compared to most newsrooms; Magid seems to want to create a haven, a place anchors can escape from news culture and look at their work with a different perspective. Wilch points out that the trip to Marion is a "good chance to get away." RTNDA panelists agreed that getting away from the hustle and bustle of a newsroom is necessary, if not always possible. If nothing else, they advised, set aside a special time for coaching, and close the office door. The advice from these consultants seems to be that traditional news culture must be left behind in order to work on modern television skills. While this separation may help an anchor focus his or her attention on presentation skills, there is also potential for conflict, because the "outsider" element is so strongly experienced.

At Magid, Wilch and Hofacker work with clients primarily on delivery and writing skills. There's a separate "appearance consultant" who helps anchors with their dress and make-up. Wilch points out that the communication specialists and the appearance consultant are

separated for a reason: "Having your hair cut differently doesn't help you communicate better," he says. Not everyone at Magid even goes to the appearance consultant; it depends on the talent, the station, and the consultants involved. For their writing skills, Magid coaching clients spent time in the little room composing copy on the typewriter provided at the desk, often using material out of the Des Moines Register. They then deliver their newscast into the minicam. Anchors who've been to Marion say that sometimes, the coaches will run the camera without telling them, so the anchors can see themselves when they are truly "being themselves," unaware of the camera's gaze.

Wilch hesitates to pinpoint any particular problems talent have when they come to Marion but say that many anchors have problems with being too "stiff" or appearing affective on camera. Hofacker and Wilch say they also try to help many anchors write in a more conversational style. For those anchors who do little of their own writing (a frequent phenomenon in very large markets) the coaches stress the importance of at least marking and editing their copy before air-time. While the purpose of this advice is to help anchors with their on-air presentation, it has an effect valued from a traditional standpoint as well: editing one's copy is standard practice in the traditional news subculture.

Magid's coaches have specific standards for what they call the nuts and bolts of anchoring. Hofacker says when it comes to pacing, pitch, body language, eye contact and voice work, she can be very precise in her recommendations.

Instead of saying "be more trustworthy," she can explain to an anchor which way to turn, or how to adjust their gaze to appear more trustworthy. Is this acting? In a way it is, says Hofacker. For instance, a person who is cold at heart may have to "act" in order to come across with more warmth. Hofacker says research will dictate which qualities an anchor may want to try to communicate more during the newscast.

The RTNDA panel agrees with the Magid coaches about the importance of specificity in performance criticism. KSL's Spence Kinard says knowledge of the performance vocabulary is one of the chief advantages of hiring an outside consultant. A news director may know something's wrong, but be unable to say exactly what it is. Huguelet says he's heard news directors tell talent to "punch it up" for years. He asks, "What the hell does that mean?" Topping advises news directors not to coach anchors if they don't know what they want. "Don't tinker," he admonishes, "You better damn-well have clearly in your mind what is you want to adjust or change. Don't tinker!"

As they pick apart the communication process into eye contact, pacing, voice pitch, and body language, the consultants are getting closer to defining just what "charisma" is. The coaches assert that a lot of what constitutes charisma can be learned, but not all. On this point, they seem to agree with the traditional contention that there's more to being a broadcast journalist than having a nice smile. For instance, explains Magid's Hofacker, she cannot "make" an anchor more credible. Yes, it is possible for someone to "cover" themselves with communication techniques if they don't really have the basics of journalism down. But Hofacker says that when things go wrong; when a TelePromTer breaks down or a live shot goes two minutes too short, a cover gets blown away. "You can't be an idiot and succeed forever," she concludes.

The communication specialists at Magid vehemently deny charges that they try to push people into molds. In fact, Hofacker says, she sometimes has to prove to talent that there are alternatives to a particular anchoring approach. She says one of the problems their students often have is in trying to meet some standard, or imitate another anchor. Hofacker says there is no set "Here's what you want to be" standard they can present to talent. Each person is different, says Wilch, "We work with what's there." Huguelet is less kind. "The best predictor of what the person can be

on the air is what they're like off the air. If a person is a hump [sic] off the air, you're not going to produce a rock and roll anchorman out of that person."

From a subcultural perspective, one of the most significant phenomenon reported by coaches is that their anchor clients value their advice. "The people who come in are generally excited," says Wilch of the people he helps at Magid. He says they are interested in what Magid has to offer. Huguelet says his students, too, are usually grateful for his help. "They'll often say, 'Thank you. This is the first time someone has actually talked to me about this.' Most people on your air really, genuinely want to improve their on air performance." Coaches, apparently, are filling a training void in the modern television subculture; a void traditionalists may deny even exists.

Still, coaches at the RTNDA forum and at Magid report having experiences with resistant talent, those who take little interest in changing their on-air skills. But is this resistance due to a traditionalist orientation? Not necessarily, according to the coaches. Hofacker says a lot of an anchor's attitude toward coaching depends on the way management has handled the situation. She says if a news director treats coaching like a punishment, something an anchors must endure because they're somehow inferior, they

will probably not enjoy the stay. Still, there are anchors who, due to a strong traditionalist orientation or mere crabbiness, refuse to accept coaching advice. "Sometimes you will lose," says Topping, and tells about his first coaching session with New York anchorman Roger Grimsby: "I said 'Good morning,'" Topping recalls, "and he said, 'I know what I do. Don't f--- with it.'"

Hofacker and Wilch say their work is kept apart from station's personnel recommendations, although they do read a station's research (which may make personnel recommendations) before starting a coaching session. Hofacker explains that promotions or demotions are handled separately, and she tries to stay far away from office politics. Hofacker keeps things straight with one revealing rule; she says, "My client is the station, not you."

Hafacker's last remark is an important consideration when analyzing changes in the journalistic subculture as experienced by television anchors. Hired by station management to help market newscasts, consultants are not necessarily in a supportive role of anchors. The rites and rituals of traditional journalistic subculture as described earlier serve to make group members more accepted into that subculture. This new ritual of coaching is foreign to traditionalists, yet seems to fill a definite need in the



modern television subculture. But while coaching may help anchors perform their modern role, it is not clear what effect it has on the acceptance and positive imagery that accompany the traditional rites and rituals.

### Values

The past twenty years have seen television news become increasingly commercial, a process which has had far-reaching effects on the roles anchors play within their occupational subculture. The final, and perhaps the most important, subcultural element to be affected by the trends of commercialization, beautification and dehumanization is the subcultural value system. Traditional journalistic subculture considers the public's needs a primary pursuit. With the tremendous profitability of television news, "success" in television journalism is equated less and less with public service, and more with the the "public's" size[88].

To meet this new standard of success, members of the modern television subculture developed a new method by which programming could be judged and evaluated by a station's business and advertising professionals: the modern television ratings system. To sell advertising time,

stations need some way to measure the number of people watching. In answer to the salesmen's needs came the "Storage Instantaneous Audimeter," known colloquially as Neilson's "Black Box." Developed in 1936 by an M.I.T. professor, the mechanism can be attached to the family set, and detect daily when the television is on, and what channel has been selected[89].

The machine was originally used to measure radio listening. Researchers started using it for television in 1950. By hooking up an audimeter to 1170 household television sets and sending the data to a mainframe computer in New York, Neilson can interpret data overnight now. The households are selected to demographically represent the U.S. population. Augmented with 2100 "diaries" (small booklets in which families manually record their viewing habits), Neilson has developed a statistically sound way of measuring what America tunes in and when[90].

By using the statistics generated by the Neilson system and other ratings services, stations are able to set their advertising rates. Decisions on whether to continue a program, modify it or drop it completely can then be made according to its profitability. Ratings allow local news programs to be judged according to their return on investment, a standard quite different than those of

fairness, speed and accuracy.

Ratings reports, known as "books" to insiders, show advertisers what kind of viewers are attracted to a particular program. Because certain demographic groups have higher disposable incomes, they become the prime target audience for all programming, including the news. Complains Ron Powers: "Local news, in fact, scarcely bothered to maintain the fiction of addressing 'citizens' at all; it ingratiated itself instead to members of some vague society called 'the 18-49 age group' -- the purchasing block of Americans most coveted by sponsors"[91].

Modern television's rating system has come under fire for its lack of validity in measuring program popularity. The Audimeter cannot tell if someone is actually watching a program, or if the set is on for "noise" while a housewife or husband does the ironing. Furthermore, ratings are no indicator of program quality. Content analyses measuring what is traditionally considered quality news content have found that a program's ratings are not related[92]. The Neilsons simply provide raw data, which can be interpreted and subsequently "sold" by advertising sales people. As Matusow puts it, "Ratings are a little like tea leaves: they can prove anything the reader wants them to"[93].

The journalistic subculture has always had to cope with commercial considerations. The change for anchors, as journalists within the modern television subculture, is the degree to which these considerations affect them personally. Consultant research, coupled with ratings research about program popularity, can make or break an individual's career, their reporting skills notwithstanding. Jessica Savitch left the local news industry because she tired of the stress involved with waiting for a ratings book to be issued for her shows, calling the process a "biennial bloodletting"[94]. There's a limited number of network reporting jobs, however, and other anchors, who may also resent the ratings system, seem to feel they have no choice but to cope with it and the new value system it represents[95].

### Summary

Three trends of change in the journalistic subculture have contributed to the creation of a "modern television" subculture. Commercialization, dehumanization and beautification each affect the roles of anchors within their occupational surroundings. Their status as journalists gives them the traditional journalistic heritage, yet they now must operate within a new group perspective. Each

element of subculture has been changed over the past twenty years: the environment, heroes, cultural network, rites and rituals and values. Station consultants, outsiders to the traditional journalistic subculture, are now an integral part of the news anchor's occupational surroundings, filling a training void apparently not met by tradition. Anchors' attitudes about consultants should reflect this subcultural transformation, and their insights can help in the search for methods that would make the consultant-anchor working relationship one of cooperation instead of conflict.

## ENDNOTES

1. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 108.
2. Michael Joseph O'Donnell, "Newscast Content of Six Iowa Television Stations: News Consultant-Retaining Stations versus Non-consultant Stations." (Masters thesis, Iowa State University, 1978), p. 8.
3. Westin, p. 13.
4. Powers, p. 129.
5. Ibid.
6. Marvin Barrett, ed. Moments of Truth? (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973), p. 90.
7. Diamond, The Tin Kazoo, p. 89.
8. Francois, p. 536.
9. Powers, p. 159.
10. Vernon Stone, "News Pays Its Way -- Or More," The Communicator, April 1985, p. 16.
11. "America: Glued to the Tube." U.S. News and World Report, 6 February 1984, p. 9.
12. Diamond, The Tin Kazoo, pp. 13-14.
13. Johnstone, Slawski, and Bowman, p. 19.
14. Roper Foundation, Trends in Attitudes Toward Television and Other Media: A 24-Year Review (New York: Roper Foundation Television Information Office, 1983), pp. 4-6.
15. Ibid., p. 6.
16. Ibid., pp. 16-17.

17. Marvin Barrett and Zachary Sklar, ed. The Eye of the Storm (New York: Lippincott and Crowell, 1980), p. 8.
18. Ibid., p. 7.
19. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 69.
20. Ibid., p. 246.
21. Ibid.
22. Vernon Stone, "Salaries Change Little in 1984," The Communicator, February 1985, p. 18.
23. Westin, p. 110.
24. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 3.
25. Ibid., p. 141.
26. Westin, p. 142.
27. Joseph P. Kahn, "What's the Difference Between Politicians and Cottage Cheese?" Inc., March 1984, p. 68.
28. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 25.
29. Kahn, p. 68.
30. Powers, p. 184.
31. Ibid., 187.
32. Ibid.
33. Barbara Matusow, "Anchors Abroad," Channels, January-February 1985, p. 41.
34. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 159.
35. Powers, p. 200.
36. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 113.
37. Powers, p. 200.
38. Matusow, The Evening Stars, pp. 112-13.

39. Ibid., p. 31.
40. Rather and Herskowitz, p. 308.
41. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 74.
42. Ibid., p. 210.
43. Westin, p. 61.
44. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 160; and Christine Craft, "The Marketing of T.V. News: My Problem and Yours," Ms. November 1983, p. 134.
45. Powers, p. 44.
46. "KPRC's Ray Miller: Show Business Has No Business in the News Business," Broadcasting, 9 May 1977, p. 84.
47. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 50.
48. Powers, p. 2.
49. "Local News Blues," Newsweek, 16 January 1978, p. 82.
50. "Chips Off the New Clone," Ms., December 1984, p. 48.
51. Savitch, p. 188.
52. "Local News Blues," p. 48.
53. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 145
54. Karen Harth, Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.
55. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 31.
56. A large portion of this chapter is based on a visit made by the author to Frank Magid and Associates in Marion, Iowa, February 28, 1984, and on a tape-recorded seminar held during the 1984 Radio-Television News Directors Association San Antonio convention. Three people were interviewed in Marion: Dan Wilch, a "communication specialist," Kris Hofacker, his supervisor, and Steve Ridge, the corporation's vice president in charge of television consultation. Frank Magid and Associates gave the author a complete tour of the facilities and spent several hours answering questions.



Participants in the RTNDA discussion included Jim Topping, a news director at KTRK, Spence Kinard, a news director from KSL in Salt Lake City, Eric Huguelet from the Atkinson and Faulder Research consulting firm in Atlanta, and Lynne Scarborough from Audience Research and Development in Dallas.

57. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 238.

58. Visit to Frank Magid and Associates.

59. Diamond, The Tin Kazoo, p. 92.

60. Ibid., p. 96.

61. Powers, p. 156; Westin, p. 213; Powers, p. 223: The Galvanic Skin Response system was originally designed to help research the popularity of music releases by record companies. Powers points out that even though its creators vehemently believed their methods were reliable, they eventually abandoned the method because of its controversial nature; Diamond, The Tin Kazoo, p. 97.

62. O'Donnell, p. 9.

63. Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook 1984 (Washington, D.C.: Broadcasting Publications, 1984), Sec. I, pp. 8-14.

64. Barrett, Moments, p. 89.

65. Ibid., p. 91.

66. Barrett, Moments, p. 91.

67. Diamond, the Tin Kazoo, p. 99.

68. Powers, p. 109.

69. Barrett, Moments, p. 89.

70. Diamond, the Tin Kazoo, p. 101.

71. Herbert Schosteck, "Factors Influencing Appeal of T.V. News Personalities," Journal of Broadcasting 18 (1973-74):63-71.

72. Keith Sanders and Michael Pritchett, "Some Influences of Appearance on Television Newscaster Appeal," Journal of Broadcasting 15 (1971):293-301.

73. Kevin Hutchinson, "Effects of Newscaster Gender," Journal of Broadcasting 26 (Winter 1982):457-67.

74. Craft, Personal interview.

75. Barrett, Moments, p. 89.

76. Ibid.

77. Powers, p. 161.

78. Ibid., p. 132.

79. O'Donnell, p. 49.

80. Ibid., p. 18.

81. Craft, Personal Interview.

82. "Chips Off the New Clone," p. 48.

83. Barrett and Sklar, p. 62.

84. John Malloy, Dress For Success (New York: Warner Brothers, 1975), p. 7.

85. Coaches at Frank Magid and Associates, for example, have none. Their background is primarily in speech or theater.

86. The following material will be drawn from both the visit to Frank Marion and Associates and the tape-recorded session from the RTNDA San Antonio Convention.

87. Sally Bedell Smith, "TV Newswoman's Suit Stirs Debate on Values in Hiring," The New York Times, 6 August 1983, sec. 1, p. 1. Audience Research and Development was the consulting firm cited in Christine Craft's suit; At the time of her allegations, its name was Media Associates. Lynne Scarborough was a witness in Crafts original Kansas City jury trial in 1983.

88. Barrett, Moments Of Truth, p. 93.

89. Powers, p. 24.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid., p. 1.
92. Matusow, The Evening Stars, p. 155.
93. Churchill L. Roberts and Sandra H. Dickson, "Assessing Quality in T.V. News," Journalism Quarterly, Summer 1984, p. 392.
94. Savitch, p. 121.
95. Anchors interviewed for this paper would sometimes complain about the ratings system, but unlike Craft, would seldom call for its abolition.

## CHAPTER IV

### METHODOLOGY

The research question posed in this thesis is qualitative in nature: How do television news anchors perceive their role as journalists within the journalistic subculture as it is influenced by the presence of station consultants? As such, the author was primarily interested in researching the feelings and opinions held by American television anchors. A qualitative study of their views, then, is an appropriate method for exploring this querie.

The thesis question can be better analyzed by breaking it down according to the various components of subculture previously described. This framework yields five sub-questions:

"How do consultants influence television anchors' perceptions of their working environment?"

"How do consultants influence the heroes television anchors admire?"

"How do consultants influence the way television anchors learn to do their jobs?"

"How do consultants influence the way television anchors perceive their day-to-day rites and rituals on the job?"

"How do consultants influence the television anchors' subcultural values?"

Focused interviews were chosen as the data-gathering methodology. The advantage of the interview approach is its degree of validity in relation to the question posed. Validity can be defined as the extent to which one is able to observe or measure what one intends to observe or measure[1].

Extended interviews, as a qualitative research tool, have three purposes: They can aid in describing phenomena, formulating hypotheses, and understanding (but not explaining) causal relationships[2]. In this case, the author wanted to describe anchors' perceptions of their relationships with consultants from a subcultural perspective, and form an hypothesis for future research. There are limitations to qualitative research. While the interviews were rich with material, their results are not statistically reliable. Concrete conclusions cannot be drawn from the findings. This was an exploratory study, designed to help describe anchors' perceptions. Future quantitative surveys can be designed based on the observations collected here.

### Sampling

Using a weighted random sampling method, the author chose 55 stations from the Broadcasting 1984 Yearbook. The Yearbook lists all commercial television stations in the United States according to their market size and in order[3]. The author chose two random numbers, one for large (the top fifty) and one for smaller markets. Starting with the random number, then, every other large market was drawn into the sample, as was every fifth small market.

For each market, the author then chose randomly from three possible network affiliations; ABC, NBC or CBS. In the smaller markets, where less than three affiliates might exist, the author would draw a second possibility when necessary. In cases where a station is affiliated with more than one network, this is noted in appendix A.

The sample is weighted in favor of larger markets because larger markets by their nature have more revenue, and therefore are more likely to retain consultants, and be influenced by the shift from traditional journalistic to modern television subculture. This is not a hard and fast rule, however. Frank Magid and Associates, for example, boasts of having about a hundred clients, and there are only about 500 commercial VHS local stations in the United States[4]. Few of the nation's 207 television markets [5]

remain untouched by consultants' influence.

### Survey Construct

Preliminary questions in the extended interview were designed to give the researcher a feel for the subjects background: their years in the business, for example, and their educational level. The subjects' gender was recorded on the surveys. Information about their race or ethnic background was not requested, and recorded only when the anchors broached the topic. Each of the questions that followed were organized according to the five elements of subculture, as indicated by the five sub-questions listed above[6]. Each of the questions has its own prediction, based on the subcultural concepts already discussed.

### The Environment

The subcultural environment, to review, includes the type and degree of competition that exists for an occupational group, and the subculture's members' relationship with the rest of the world. In television news, competition outside the organization is centered on attracting the attention of those in the outside world; the people who make up an audience. Changes in the news subculture have an influence on an anchor's relationship

with viewers. The first broad research question, "How do consultants affect television anchors' perceptions of their working environment?" is represented by five specific questions on the survey:

"What is the ideal relationship between an anchor and his or her audience?"

"If you could tell the audience one thing about your job, something you don't think they understand, what would you tell them?"

"Have you ever been promoted as a personality?"

"How do those promotions make you feel?"

"What effect does that sort of promotion have on the way you approach your job?"

The modern television subcultural environment promotes the importance of an anchor's personality or charisma; what's been called the trend toward beautification. This trend is expected to be reflected through a new "friendlier" relationship to the audience, as opposed to the cool professionalism or toughness of traditional subculture. Given the changing role of anchors as journalists within the modern television subculture, they may report some internal confusion between what the outside world perceives them to be and their own self-image. Anchors are expected to answer that they feel somehow misunderstood by the audience; that



the audience does not understand the anchors' traditional journalistic heritage.

The commercialization of television news may be reflected if anchors discuss the profit-making function of local television news. The trend of dehumanization, or emerging role of anchors as "products" is expected to be reflected in their answers to questions about promotions. Because of the apparent conflict between traditional and modern television subcultures, anchors are expected to dislike promotions because the promotions' emphasis on "personality" rather than reportorial skills.

### Heroes

As the nature of their occupational subculture changes, the people anchors choose as heroes are changing. One particular individual personifies these changes: Christine Craft. Craft represents herself as a traditional journalist in television; because of her recent prominence, she may have become a new subcultural hero.

In 1983, Christine Craft successfully sued her former employer, KMBC, Kansas City, for contractual fraud. She lost on a charge of sex discrimination. At the root of her anger was a demotion that came in 1981, when Craft said she was told she would no longer anchor because consultant

research determined she was "too old, too ugly and not deferential enough to men"[7]. At this writing, however, she has been unsuccessful in receiving damages from KMBC; two federal judges have overruled the jury awards[8].

Craft's case brought a myriad of issues to the public's attention that once were usually argued only by journalists. She attacked consultants; she attacked the ratings system; and she attacked what she considered to be show business in local newscasts. Craft hit a nerve. Her allegations of sex discrimination were followed by dozens of "yea's" from anchors around the country, as well as plenty of boos[9].

"The job of a journalist," said Craft in an interview in 1984, "...is not to give the public what they want...it's to give them the news...Our job is not to make them feel warm and cuddly"[10]. To explore the research question, "How do consultants affect the leaders television anchors admire?" the following survey question was included:

"What do you think of the Christine Craft case?"

Is Craft a modern hero? In the course of the research interviews, anchors are expected to praise her for her defense of traditional journalistic values and her expressed desire to preserve the dignity of the profession.

### The Cultural Network

The introduction of consultants to the journalistic subculture has changed the way television news anchors are socialized into their occupation. Because they are outsiders to traditional the journalistic subculture, consultants have come under fire from journalists in all segments of the profession. This survey provided a systematic inquiry into the way local anchors feel about this particular change in the subculture. For the research question, "How do consultants affect the way television anchors learn to do their jobs?" the following specific survey questions were included:

"What kind of contact have you ever had with a consulting agency?"

"What do you think is the proper role for a consultant?"

"What kind of coaching have you had from your news director, editor or other person in the station?"

The author expect anchors to report negative experiences, being forced into a "product" role for the modern television subculture, betraying traditional subcultural norms. Anchors are expected to want limitations on the influence consultants have on their subculture. Anchors may answer that they've had little guidance from in-house leaders, because the norms of traditional

journalistic subculture do not provide for training in appearance or charisma.

### Rites and Rituals

Changes in the subculture have affected the day-to-day activities and rewards experienced by anchors in their role as journalists. Consultant coaching has become a new rite of passage for anchors, and may have an effect on anchors' job satisfaction. For the research question, "How do consultants affect the way television anchors perceive their day-to-day rites and rituals on the job?" Five survey questions apply:

"How important is appearance to your job?"

"How much do you worry about your own appearance?"

"What effect do you think your appearance has had on your career?"

"Is it possible for anchors to be themselves on the air?"

"Are you yourself?"

In light of the de-humanization trend outlined earlier in the thesis, anchors are expected to answer that they worry more about their appearance more than they would prefer. They may report feeling forced to fit into an outsider's definition of what an anchor should look like according to research. Because of their traditional

journalistic heritage, the author expects anchors to downplay the emphasis their looks have had on their careers, while observing that a good appearance can help, and a bad appearance hinder, an anchor's career progress.

### Values

The commercialization of television news has brought about a change in subcultural values. Modern television values are based on ratings points, and place less emphasis on the public's needs as opposed to the public's "wants." The final research question, "How do consultants affect the television anchors' subcultural values?" is intended to examine the ideologies of anchors within the modern television subculture. Five survey questions address this topic:

"How have your attitudes about the job changed since you first started?"

"If you could change one thing about your job, what would it be?"

"What is the purpose of a local television news operation?"

"Are you satisfied with your career?"

"How much of your job is show business, or performance, and how much of it is journalism, or substance?"

De-humanization, commercialization and beautification may all be experienced as negative trends in television news because they differ from traditional ideals. Changes in their idealistic framework are expected to influence the way anchors feel about their jobs. They may report feeling more cynical, and less idealistic, about their work. They may be unhappy in their position and express feelings of conflict that reflect the changes from traditional to modern values. Anchors are expected to report that too much of what they do is style-oriented, and that not enough attention is paid to matters of substance.

### Procedure

The news director from each station in the survey was contacted by phone and mail to obtain the names of three potential interviewees, yielding 165 possible members for the sample. The top anchors of a station were requested; in some cases, news director and anchor were one in the same. Some of the smaller stations used less than three anchors, some refused to participate in the study, and several never responded to written requests for the names of potential interviewees. A total of sixty-seven interviews were completed. Correspondence, the stations surveyed, and the names of each anchor interviewed are listed in the appendix.

Each of the anchors was interviewed using the same set of questions in the same order. The author was flexible about occasionally re-wording questions for clarity[11]. Because some of the anchors' answers became very long, the author would write down key words to characterize the essence of the comment.

The extended interview approach allowed anchors to discuss personal experiences, which might not be specifically recalled using a multiple-choice questionnaire. Furthermore, because the author was looking for emotional responses to certain practices, the open-ended answer approach was deemed most appropriate. The author attempted at all times to deliver the questions objectively.

Each interview took from ten minutes to a half-hour to complete. Anchors were usually contacted at their station while on duty, although a few made appointments to be contacted at home. The author used large pre-printed forms for each interview, with sufficient writing space after each question. Interviews were conducted over a period of several months, from November 1984, through March 1985. Each interview was followed up by a thank-you letter. Subjects who requested results of the study were promised an executive summary.

Occasionally, the individuals originally named to the sample resigned or took leave as the study went on. Those who could not be reached after three or more attempts to make interview appointments were omitted from the research. Several interviews were incomplete; subjects would be called away half-way through, and later could not be reached again to finish. One female anchor, Jerri Harris of KOCO, became suspicious of the interviewer after the first few questions. "How old are you?" she asked, and wanted to make sure the interviewer was indeed a student, and not a representative of Magid. Attempts to allay her fears did not seem to persuade her. Harris cut off the interview, saying she didn't have time to continue.

Harris, of course, was not the only reluctant interviewee. Those who were persuaded to finish, however, often closed the conversation on a more upbeat note. "Nobody's ever asked me that before," said a few, and seemed pleased that someone did. Of course, there were a few who were convinced that the interviewer was wasting her time and theirs on trivial matters. Positive and negative impressions of the study were not recorded on the interview forms, though, so as not to skew their analysis according to the author's pleasant or unpleasant memories of a conversation.



### Analysis

A content analysis was performed on each survey to help interpret the data. The author attempted to find clusters of answers to each question, so that trends could be detected. For instance, to the question, "What kind of experience have you ever had with consultants," the author categorized answers into "generally positive," "generally negative" and "neutral." Surveys were coded according to both manifest and latent content, as defined by Babbie in The Practice of Social Research. Latent content, according to Babbie, is interpretive and searches for the answer's connotative meaning. Manifest content, then, is denotative[12]. To questions such as "How many years have you been a television journalist," coding was based on manifest content. For questions like, "What do you think of the Christine Craft case," the author coded surveys according to latent content.

Results of the interviews have been broken down according to the subcultural framework that has been used throughout this paper. In their interviews, the anchors addressed all three of the trends of change identified in previous chapters; de-humanization, beautification and commercialization. When possible, their answers were quantified with frequency runs from the "Statistical Package

for the Social Sciences" computer software served only to help the author organize data, and was intended not to represent statistically significant empirical conclusions, but to support the validity of this subcultural analysis[13].

## ENDNOTES

1. Gordon, p. 4
2. Stephen Cole, The Sociological Method: An Introduction to the Science of Sociology, 3rd ed. (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1980), pp. 79-80.
3. Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook 1984, pp. C1-204.
4. Francois, p. 536.
5. Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook 1984, pp. C1-204.
6. The interview questions, in order, can be found in appendix B.
7. Craft, Personal Interview.
8. "Appeals Court Overturns \$325,000 Award to Craft," The Des Moines Register, 29 June 1985, p. 3A.
9. "Mi\$\$fortune," The Times Delphic (Des Moines: Drake University), 14 February 1984, p. 4.
10. Craft, Personal Interview.
11. A useful guide for anyone undertaking this kind of research is published by the University of Michigan: The Interviewer's Manual (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Institute for Social Research, 1976). It provides many practical suggestions for conducting interview research.
12. Earl Babbie, The Practice of Social Research 2nd ed. (Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 1979), p. 240.
13. "Statistical Package for the Social Sciences," computer software (Hightstown, N.J.: McGraw-Hill, 1983).

## CHAPTER V

### RESULTS

In their more philosophical discussions, whether in academic situations or over a pitcher of beer, journalists will sometimes debate whether there exists a universal truth, from which all things could be viewed and judged objectively. Some journalist-philosophers say no grand "Truth" exists. Even those reporters who side with the existence of a universal truth, though, cannot always say what it is, and fall back, for practical reasons, on life's little truths.

In talking with news anchors around the United States, it becomes apparent that when discussing the relationship between anchors and consultants, one must frequently deal in "little truths." While some of the answers given during their extended interviews have been coded, categorized and counted, some of the more pertinent information; the "little truths" that reveal so much about their experiences as human beings, can fall between the cracks. Thus, the qualitative approach has served a useful purpose in this study, for in interpreting and analyzing the interviews as a

whole, valuable impressions and emotions have not been lost.

All three of the trends of change described earlier in this paper; dehumanization, beautification and commercialization, will be present in the following analysis. Because of the methodology chosen for this analysis, chances of losing the richness of the humanity of the subjects' responses is minimized. In this section, the anchors' stories, opinions and ideas about the changes taking place within their subculture will be analyzed. The frequencies of individual answers to the interview questions can be found in the tables provided. Since the interviews were not designed to provide statistically significant results, this section will ignore the exact numbers, for the most part, and will look for meaningful trends and ideas in the interviews.

#### Preliminary Information

The manifest content of the interviews included respondent's sex, number of years in television, number of years anchoring, and educational level. The group interviewed for this paper proved to reflect the findings of Johnstone et al.: journalists are an eclectic bunch. More than half of the group had journalism degrees, nearly a

third had college degrees in something other than journalism. Subjects reported studying everything from political science and consumerism to drama[TABLE 2].

TABLE 2

## EDUCATION

		FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NO DEGREE		11	16.9
JOURN DEGREE		34	52.3
NONJOURN DEGREE		20	30.8
NO ANSWER		2	(MISSING)
TOTAL		67	100.0
VALID CASES	65	MISSING CASES	2

More than a third of the group had been in television five years or less; another third reported they'd worked in television news ten to twenty years. About ten percent of the anchors said they'd been in the business more than twenty years. These numbers do not necessarily reflect the ages of the subjects; as predicted in The News People, many of the respondents said they'd spent time in other professions before entering television, while others started when they came of working age[TABLE 3].

TABLE 3

## YEARS IN TELEVISION

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1-5 YEARS	25	37.3
6-10 YEARS	12	17.9
10-20 YEARS	22	32.8
20 OR MORE YEARS	8	11.9
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

A curve similar in shape to the one reflecting the anchors' years in television can be drawn from data collected about their years as anchors. Almost half the people interviewed had been anchors for five years or less. For the six to ten year category, the numbers dip again, and then head back up again for the ten to twenty year category. One respondent had been an anchor more than twenty years. The stereotyped contention that anchoring is a "young person's game" seems disqualified by this set of interviews [TABLE 4]. That contention may hold, however, for women; several female respondents reported having fears about their future due to age prejudice. While the author asked no questions about race, the subject often came up during the interviews. Apparently race, as it encompasses one's appearance, has had an effect, or at least a perceived effect, on some anchor's careers. The study performed on this paper was not intended to examine discrimination. Yet

some of the women and blacks included in the interviews said discrimination exists in the industry; biases which may keep them from "growing old" in their jobs, or moving up because a station "already has" a black anchor[1].

TABLE 4

## YEARS ANCHORING

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
1-5 YEARS	32	47.8
6-10 YEARS	11	16.4
10-20 YEARS	22	32.8
20 OR MORE YEARS	2	3.0
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

When analyzing the remaining interview questions, it's important to keep in mind the diversity of people represented[TABLES 5, 6]. All of these people are at various stages of their careers, yet all of them are working in an occupational environment in transition from old to new. The growing pains that can accompany this particular transition, while affecting each individual differently, have formed some patterns; some expected, as outlined in Chapter IV, others surprising. Examining these patterns can aid in understanding how the nature of an anchor-consultant relationship can affect the ultimate news "product".



TABLE 5  
BREAKDOWN BY SEX

---

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
MALE	42	62.7
FEMALE	25	37.3
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	67	100.0

---

TABLE 6  
JOB EXPERIENCE  
(FREQUENCIES OF THREE CATEGORIES)

---

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
PRODUCING	24	35.8
(NO PRODUCING)	43	64.2
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	67	100.0
RADIO	42	62.7
(NO RADIO)	25	37.3
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	67	100.0
OTHER	33	49.2
(NO "OTHER")	34	50.8
	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	68	100.0

---

### The Environment

Previous chapters have presented some conflicts between the traditional and modern journalistic subcultures. The competitive modern environment has turned anchors into consumer goods, in a way; anchors are sold to an audience they hardly know. Dehumanization was the primary subject of the questions in this part of the survey. Anchors were expected to talk about differences between their public and private selves, and assess their relationship with the public. Traditional journalists favor a cool, matter-of-fact approach to the public; in order to sell the news, however, a warmer "friendlier" approach is often used in the modern subculture. Anchors were expected to experience role conflict as they tried to balance old and new.

### Promotions

None of the anchors interviewed in this study had stories to tell as colorful as Geraldo Rivera's account of how he was "created"[2], but many are conscious of their status as a "product." Commented one anchor: "You sell the news like you sell toothpaste"[3]. The great majority of the subjects have been promoted by their stations[TABLE 7]. Promotions include printed advertisements in the local T.V. Guide, billboards, television spots and placards on city

buses. The group seemed pretty evenly split on how they react to such promotions. Roughly a third each repoded negatively, positively, or neutrally to the question, "How do those promotions make you feel?"[TABLE 8].

TABLE 7  
HAVE YOU EVER BEEN  
PROMOTED AS A PERSONALITY?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
YES	60	89.6
NO	7	10.4
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

TABLE 8  
HOW DO THOSE PROMOTIONS  
MAKE YOU FEEL?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	
CHEERED	20	32.8	
DISCOMFORT	16	26.2	
NEUTRAL	23	37.7	
OTHER	2	3.3	
NO ANSWER	6	(MISSING)	
	-----	-----	
TOTAL	67	100.0	
VALID CASES	61	MISSING CASES	6

Some of the negative reactions grew out of what the anchors perceived as unprofessional promotions. For instance, Jane Gardner, the first anchorwoman at WVEC in New Hampton, Virginia, reports that when she first started there, the station produced a commercial that showed her walking alone across the field at the local sports arena. Her co-anchor was in the stands...obviously watching her legs. An announcer's voice proclaimed her, "Jane Gardner, girl on the go." A television reporter since she turned eighteen, Gardner was insulted. She's appreciated subsequent promotions, but says, "that one made me mad"[4]. Susan Alderman, an anchor from WPTA in Fort Wayne, Indiana, had a similar experience; consultant research found that many viewers found her air personality "harsh," so the station started a promotional campaign with the slogan, "Susan has a heart," and the station has assigned her to do a number of highly visible "soft" stories on children. She's not angry, but finds the promotions irritating[5].

Bus placards and billboards were another source of discomfort for many anchors. Gordon Peterson, nightly anchor for WDVM in Washington, D.C., is black. His co-anchor used to be Max Robinson, who now works for ABC. Peterson recalls this comment from Robinson when they first were promoted on a bus: "It took us years to get off the back of the bus, and here we are again"[6]. WSMV's Demetria

Kalademos of Nashville says, "The only (promotion) that ever bothered me was having my face on the back of the bus and getting mud on it"[7].

The anchors who felt positive about being promoted through advertisements admitted that it gave their egos a boost. This response was heard less frequently from the older anchors. One anchor recalls sending a copy of T.V. Guide home to his mother before his newly found fame lost its appeal. News director/anchor Charlie Swank of WHIZ in Zanesville, Ohio, gave this honest reaction: "They're good for the ego. I hate to admit it, but they are"[8]. But after eighteen years in the business, KOCO's Jack Bowen of Oklahoma City says the initial thrill of "Whoa, I'm on T.V...Lookit my picture!" has disappeared. "It's easy to get enamored with that stuff," Bowen explains, "You can forget what life is all about. No matter how good you get, if you build your life around this business, you're going to be disappointed"[9].

When responses were positive or negative, the issue for respondents was the degree to which the promotions reflected their own self-image. The traditional veneration for truth crops up here; anchors seem to favor those promotions that are accurate about the people they portray. Those promotions that did not reflect the persona the anchor

wanted to present to the world were more likely to be perceived negatively, or dehumanizing. One anchor, Keith Edwards of WFIE, considers a promotional campaign just part of the job, which "helps promote your product," he explains, but warns, "you'd better be able to back it up"[10]. Karen Harth of WNEP says, "You want to fulfill everything they're saying...fulfill that promise. It makes you want to try harder"[11]. Personality promotion may be part of the modern television subculture, but apparently some stations have found a way to blend them with traditional goals in a way that makes them palatable for news anchors.

### The Anchor/Audience Relationship

The modern television audience is very large, and has no way of directly giving feedback to news anchors. As Lynne Scarborough pointed out, the communication is one-way. Consequently, for questions on this subject, anchors again were expected to address the trend of dehumanization, whether they experienced the phenomenon themselves, or whether they perceived the audience in a more depersonalized way.

Three key words; "friendly," "professional," and "trust," came up over and over again when anchors answered the question, "What is the ideal relationship between an anchor and his or her audience?" In the content analysis, each of these words, or a designated synonym, was given equal weight[TABLE 9]. Consequently, one interview might be counted for all three words, another survey might have only one of the words included, and some anchors used none of the words to describe their ideal. In the study at hand, the most useful information found with this question on the interview is that anchors certainly do not share the precisely same view of the people they talk to night after night. There appears to be a continuum from "very friendly and familiar" reflecting the modern television subcultural attitudes, to "cool and professional," associated more with the traditional journalistic subculture.

Some specific examples: Larry Johnson of WDAM uses two of the key words in his description of the ideal. "They have to trust and like him," says Johnson, "They must like him, too. There are two sides to it; one side is totally disconnected with news"[12].

TABLE 9

HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE THE IDEAL  
ANCHOR-VIEWER RELATIONSHIP?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
TRUST	28	41.7
(NOT MENTIONED)	39	58.3
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0
FRIENDLY	39	58.2
(NOT MENTIONED)	28	41.8
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0
PROFESSIONAL	29	43.3
(NOT MENTIONED)	38	56.7
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

"I'm an invited guest into your home," explains Bob Koop of WIVB, "a nice guy...I don't put my feet on your furniture, don't make a pass at your daughter"[13]. Claudia Barr of WHBQ is another anchor who puts a lot of emphasis on friendliness. Her approach to the public is one of "We're in this together"[14]. Tomi Jo Taylor, however, after anchoring less than a year at KECY in El Centro, California, warns that it's possible to be too well-liked. She describes the ideal relationship as "personable, but not the best of friends"[15]. Ellen Maynard, WMAZ, also included "a little bit of distance" in her prescription[16].



Anchors do not seem to feel alienated from the audience, if answers to this question are any indication. They seem to have found a way to adapt their own humanity to what they believe fits the public's expectations. Mutual respect, or words to that effect, was one of the most frequent descriptors given. The anchors said that in order to communicate effectively with an audience, they, as anchors, must address that audience on equal terms. When anchors talked about authority, they used the words "credible" or "professional." No one openly espoused a strict paternalistic or pedagogic approach, which could indicate that the traditional era of Walter Cronkite's perceived omniscience is coming to an end. A notable few anchors described themselves as educators, taking a slightly elitist approach, but they'd qualify this role by saying, "a friendly" teacher, or "caring" teacher.

### The Audience

For themselves, anchors seem comfortable with the idea of being "human" on the air. The traditional subculture's pedagogy has been transformed into "a little distance" for the sake of professionalism. The audience, instead, seems to be perceived in more dehumanizing terms. By and large, anchors seem to feel a bit misunderstood. The question "if you could tell your audience one thing about your job,

something you don't think they understand, what would you tell them?" yielded some answers that could be categorized[TABLE 10]. The top answer: "We write!" The many anchors who answered this way are often asked by the public what they do between the six and ten o'clock news. Other common answers include, "it's not a glamorous job," and "the audience should not depend solely on television for news."

TABLE 10

WHAT WOULD YOU LIKE TO  
TELL THE AUDIENCE?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
WE WRITE	30	46.2
NOT GLAMOROUS	7	10.8
READ MORE	12	18.5
OTHER	16	24.6
NO ANSWER	2	(MISSING)
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0
MISSING CASES	2	

Larry Hunter of WDAM explains, "Reasonably intelligent people think I work a half-hour a day"[17]. Sandy Arnn of WKTV in Utica, New York, thinks some members of the audience aren't even "reasonably intelligent" on the matter of what anchors do with their time. "I don't know how they think all these tapes come in," he says[18].

Many respondents felt the audience put them on a pedestal, or no longer thought of them as a human being. Anchors who want viewers to see them as ordinary people are represented by Jim Rennick of WNEP, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania. Rennick says, "Don't hold us up on a pedestal. We're just people doing a job"[19].

Along those lines, some of the answers reflected a desire to convince the audience that anchors are not omnipotent. "Tell them I'm powerless when tapes go bad," said Ken Schwall of WBIR, Knoxville[20]. Perhaps some members of the audience believe what's claimed in anchor promotions, and the anchors feel they can't fulfill the subsequent high expectations. Another possibility is that the anchors don't want to fulfill those expectations, not only because of the dehumanization factor, but because of the concurrent trend toward beautification. Kathy Brock begs, "don't judge us too harshly on looks...please look a little deeper"[21]. In Wichita Falls, Texas, Lisa Koseoglu sums up her frustration: "It's a real strange position...You work all day long on a newscast... and somebody calls you up afterward to tell you (that) you have too much blush on"[22].

## Summary

The modern occupational environment for television anchors has challenges not addressed in traditional journalistic subculture. Television news anchors must overcome a great deal of distance if they are to communicate with the audience as human beings. Yet while anchors sense that they need to "be human," they may be pumped up by personality promotions that increase distances, emphasizing traits the anchors do not consider important. So even while the traditional paternalistic approach to reading the news may be eroding, the anchor perceives that audience misunderstands his or her job, and the result can feel dehumanizing.

## Heroes

Modern television's news heroes have been described as "stars." Is it possible for a person who espouses traditional subculture values to still be a hero? The question, "What do you think of the Christine Craft case?" brought some of the most emotional responses of the interviews, and would often provide anchors with a base for arguments further along in the conversation.

Because the three trends identified could be expected to cause dissatisfaction and confusion for anchors, the author expected to hear supportive comments about Craft, but the results were mixed. Less than a third flatly supported her in her lawsuit. Another segment said her case raised some good issues. A significant portion, including Bob Koop of WIVB, Buffalo who stated, "I only know what I see in the papers," said they didn't know[23]. Negative responses came in two forms: some said Craft should have expected her experience, and that her allegations were naive; the others believed management had the right to demote her or fire her at will[TABLE 11]. An analysis performed to see if an anchor's feelings were related to their gender found no such connection.

TABLE 11

WHAT DO YOU THINK OF  
THE CHRISTINE CRAFT CASE?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
SHOULD EXPECT	9	13.4
MGMT RIGHTS	11	16.4
DON'T KNOW	12	17.9
GOOD ISSUES	15	22.4
SYMPATHIZE	20	29.9
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

Marlene Schneider of WFSB is a sympathizer. When she first started anchoring, she says, her boss told her to cut her hair and "to be nice to the guys"[24]. Jane Gardner of WVEC, New Hampton, Virginia, also sympathized with Craft. "She had experiences that most others have shared," says Gardner, "I was surprised that she won"[25]. Eight-year veteran Lynne Gansar of WDSU in New Orleans is involved in a lawsuit of her own. Gansar says at her former station, the man hired to co-anchor with her was paid twice her salary, even though Gansar had seniority. She too, has had clothing and "color" advice from a consultant, but says the experiences were not like those Craft talks about. "I would resent it if someone in the station tried to tell me what to wear on what day. Enough is enough!" says Gansar[26].

Demetria Kalademos of WSMV, Nashville, followed the Craft case closely for a special reason. Kalademos says WSMV is the first station to allow her to use her real name. Previously, she was known as "Demetria K," and was told by a news director that her name was "offensive." Kalademos was especially irritated by what she saw as a double standard. The "Polish guys" she knew in television "got to keep their names"[27]. Jacquie Walker of WIVB admires Craft. "Most women in the business should thank their lucky stars that she had the guts to do what she did." Walker asserts that discrimination against women in television is "very real"[28].

Complaints about sexism in the business were not exclusive among the female anchors. Madison, Wisconsin anchor Randy Meier of WKBT, did a term paper about Craft's case in college (he's been an anchor one year) and says he "sympathizes with her greatly." He says he sees sexism in the industry, and does not see it going away[29]. David James of Evansville Indiana's WFIE, echoes Meier's statement: "I've seen sexism in the eleven years I've been in television. In fact, I still see it...I think she's kind of a pioneer, and I'm all for her. Managers have been getting away with murder for years"[30]. Rick Notter of WFIE, Evansville, Indiana, supported Craft on more traditional grounds: "I'm glad she won. I think too often some of our rights are taken away...especially in this business. Too often you're judged on looks, not journalism or ethics"[31].

Even though no statistical correlation exists between the sympathy toward Craft and sex, women who disagreed with Craft's allegations seemed to be more vehement about it than men. Perhaps, because their arrival coincided with the onset of the modern television news subculture, they are more likely to accept its emphasis on beauty[32]. Elizabeth Long, a young anchor at WLIO, Lima, Ohio, pointed out, "We all know looks matter"[33]. Tomi Jo Taylor, who has since

left KECY in El Centro, California, thinks KMBC handled Craft's case inappropriately, but when it comes to demoting an anchor, "I think a station absolutely has the right to do that...We are not just journalists"[34].

Vicki Kennedy, who works in Joplin, Missouri, the site of Craft's second trial, had a chance to view the proceedings more closely than others and concluded, "I think she did look kind of doggy on the air. It's more or less the breaks of the game"[35]. Cindi Brucato of KSTP, Minneapolis, calls the Craft case "a lot of B.S...I have no sympathy for her"[36].

Jim Rennick, a weekend anchor at WNEP, Wilkes-Barre, Pennsylvania, is another anchor who thinks Craft was naive. "The best reporter in the world won't get on the air if they're ugly as a toad," says Rennick, "People get hired and fired for crazy reasons"[37]. Brandon Brooks, of WTAJ in Altoona, Pennsylvania, had a mixed review: "She was getting into a situation in which she should have known the rules...as for not being deferential to men, well, that sucks"[38].

A common theme heard in the interviews asserted that Craft suit actually hurt women in broadcasting. Larry Johnson, WDAM, Hattiesburg, Mississippi, thinks Craft was unfair to the industry. "Management has the right to pick



and choose. She probably did more harm than good for women," says Johnson[39]. Tina Hicks, who has worked for WMAZ in Macon, Georgia, since she was a teenager, says, "Even if Christine was right or wrong, if someone wants to fire a woman in this industry, they will find a way to do it...only now, they won't be obvious about it"[40].

### Summary

Dehumanization, commercialization, beautification: all trends that might be perceived as negatives by traditionalists, are now, apparently, accepted by a significant number of anchors. Those who, like Craft, claim to hold dearly to traditional tough, matter-of-fact standards, are not necessarily going to win applause from their peers. This could mean that anchors do not perceive the changes occurring in their world as negative. It could also mean that they see problems with the changes, but have chosen to compromise tradition and modern realities in order to survive in their chosen career.

### The Cultural Network

Consultants are symbolic representatives of the modern television subculture, and indications from the literature are that consultants are often blamed for any complaints journalists have about this new subcultures[41]. In this

part of the interview, anchors were expected to resent consultants, especially consultant coaches, who play a direct role in teaching anchors how to be good "products." Anchors were also expected to indicate that the traditional sources of journalistic teaching did not provide this kind of information; this too was expected to breed resentment.

The results for this section were surprising: for many of the anchors interviewed, it seems consultants, especially consultant-coaches, are slowly being accepted; apparently because consultants help them cope with the modern television subculture. While it's borne out that traditional newsroom teachers do not help them with presentation skills, this "outsider" status does not necessarily seem to breed resentment in and of itself.

This section of the interview provided some valuable, practical insights into the relationship between anchors and consultants. From answers to these questions, it was possible to detect some factors which contribute to a positive or negative working relationship. These include the manner in which consultants are employed by station management; the anchor's assessment of the "usefulness of their information; and the anchors' attitudes about the beautification trend.

### Reviewing the Consultants

Not all anchors in the study had had contact with news consultants. Nearly everyone, though, had opinions on what a consultant's proper role should be. After reviewing the criticisms of news directors and critics, the author expected to hear a strong negative response from anchors. While there were negative responses, there were more positive and mixed opinions about consultants. In fact, fully more than a third of the respondents reported having positive experiences with consultants. A little over a fifth of them had mixed reviews; another fifth had negative experiences[TABLES 12, 13].

TABLE 12

#### ANCHORS' CONTACT WITH CONSULTANTS

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
POSITIVE	25	37.3
MIXED	15	22.4
NEGATIVE	14	20.9
NONE	13	19.4
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

TABLE 13

ANCHORS' IMPRESSIONS  
OF THEIR CONTACT WITH CONSULTANTS

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
MAGID	16	23.9
COACHED	19	28.4
NOT COACHED	31	46.3
NO ANSWER	1	1.5
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

First, the positive: Greg Baker, a news director and anchor for WTHI, Terre Haute, Indiana, said news consultants help "spread the common knowledge"[42]. This library, or clearinghouse function, was frequently identified as a useful resource. Consultants were also praised for their ability to provide fresh insight; an outsider's objective view of a station's operations. Shuttling tapes around the country for ideas, providing demographic research and helping anchors learn the little "tricks" that help them come across better on the air were all mentioned as valuable contributions.

Those interviewed often differentiated between the consultant's role as a researcher and advisor. In fact, in the content analysis of answers to the question, "What do you think is the proper role for a consultant?" "Research only" was the answer given by a few respondents[TABLE 14].

The majority said consultants should give advice on a limited basis. That is, control of the newsroom (the subculture) must stay in the hands of news directors (subculture leaders). The same number who want consultants as "researchers only" said that consultants had no role to fulfill in television news.

TABLE 14

WHAT IS THE CONSULTANT'S PROPER ROLE  
IN TELEVISION NEWS?

	FREQUENCY		PERCENT	
NONE	5		7.9	
LIMITED	45		71.4	
RESEARCH ONLY	5		7.9	
OTHER	6		9.5	
AS IS	2		3.2	
NO ANSWER	4		(MISSING)	
	-----		-----	
TOTAL	68		100.0	
VALID CASES	63	MISSING CASES	4	

-----

      Anchors who talked about positive experiences with consultants in general usually talked specifically about their interactions with consultant-coaches; ironically, the very people expected to incite the most resentment among anchors. Boston's Liz Walker of WBZ said her visit to Magid's headquarters was helpful. She said no one tried to force her into a mold (in part, she theorized, because she is black and there was no black-female mold to fill) or tell

her she had to do anything in particular. Walker watched a number of tapes made by other anchors, and the tapes were presented to her with the idea that, "These are people who have succeeded"[43].

Ellen Maynard of WMAZ said a consultant helped her with makeup and clothes; "lots of details I never thought of." What did they teach her about clothes? "If you look like a Republican, you're OK"[44]. Karen Harth of WNEP said of her visit to Magid, "I had all these visions of them saying, 'dye your hair blonde,' and so on...and they didn't!"[45]. Beautification is apparently acceptable within limits; those limits are set by individuals.

Mixed reviews or negative experiences were not always the result of a consultant's operation within a newsroom. Management's misuse of consultants and their information seems to be the root of many problems. Speaking from WFIE in Evansville, Indiana, weeknight anchor David James says that when consultants visited his station, "Management did not brief talent on what they were trying to do...I think they like to keep everyone off guard"[46]. Managers who rely on consultants without question cause a lot of concern and anger, too. A seemingly unending theme of the surveys was that consultants have to be "taken with a grain of salt." KOCO's Jack Bowen wishes that past managers had put

more constraints on consultants who visited his newsroom: "Everybody was scared to death. They (consultants) just love to come in and bark orders"[47].

Conversely, news directors who stand their ground against consultants, and keep control, won praise from anchors. A consultant told WLEX's news director that the anchor team Amye Brandli worked with would never make it. The consultant was ignored, Brandli stayed on, and she said their newscasts were succeeding in the ratings war[48]. A number of anchors felt management was being sold a bill of goods by consultants; that outsiders had nothing to offer that the newsroom staff (those within the subculture) could not obtain for themselves. Twelve-year veteran Larry Johnson of WDAM in Hattiesburg, Mississippi, remarked that consultants "feel an obligation to change things to justify their salaries. I've never seen them make any improvements"[49]. Larry Connors of KTVI said, "They're never going to say, 'that's perfect, take us off the payroll'"[50].

Some of the negative reviews were scathing. WDVM's Gordon Peterson: "They call it research, here...they're really creeps." What does he think is the best role for consultants? "Go into another line of work; dog food companies, or contraceptives"[51]. Steve Dunn of WILX in

Lansing, Michigan, said he "wouldn't be hurt if they disappeared. They're paid to make decisions about the obvious"[52]. Peter Vissar, anchor and news director for WDTV said "Generally speaking, I despise them"[53].

#### In-Group Versus Outsider Training

The phenomenon of consultants as allies emerges most clearly in answers to the question, "What kind of coaching have you ever had from a news director, editor or other person in the station?" Most anchors, apparently, receive talent coaching from outside consultants. The majority reported having received no coaching from a leader within the subculture. A smaller percentage said they'd received "some" coaching from an editor or news director, and a few said they learned all their on-air techniques from a subculture leader[TABLE 15]. Because consultants are the primary source of information for on-air presentation, they have become friends to those anchors who feel abandoned. To succeed in the modern television culture, anchors seem to feel they need more stylistic help than the traditional subculture provides.



TABLE 15

BREAKDOWN OF ANCHORS  
WHO'VE BEEN COACHED BY SUBCULTURAL "INSIDERS"

-----			
		FREQUENCY	PERCENT
NONE		39	59.1
SOME		19	28.8
ALL		8	12.1
NO ANSWER		1	(MISSING)
		-----	-----
TOTAL		67	100.0
VALID CASES	66	MISSING CASES	1
-----			

Steve Dunn of WILX is an exception: his boss does coach talent regularly. Dunn said he and his news director would sit down with a tape every week[54]. Lynne Gansar's experience, however, is far more common. Shortly after being hired as a reporter eight years ago, the station's weeknight anchor left, and Gansar was suddenly on the air. "I was literally thrown to the dogs to be the six and ten anchor...and you learn really fast when you're in that sort of situation"[55]. David James of WFIE in Evansville was supposed to be a temporary substitute when he replaced a weeknight anchor there. He ended up as the permanent anchor. "I was kind of thrown into this," he explained[56].

Keith Edwards, also of WFIE, said not only did he receive little coaching from news directors, but that "...a lot of news directors I've worked for can't do it"[57].

Many of the anchors in the sample who've had no coaching from their news directors said they learned from other anchors, by watching the networks, and by trial and error. A few anchors said their station general managers or salesmen gave them ideas for their on-air presentation, and many more said the only place they ever were formally taught methods for delivering a newscasts was in a session with a consultant. Those consultants presented in Chapter IV advised that it is possible for a news director to coach his or her own staff, but that it must be done regularly, and a news director must have an understanding of coaching principles[58]. Apparently, this is uncommon.

### Summary

An interesting contrast appears in analyzing the interviews for this section. The anchors surveyed apparently resent a station's lack of faith in traditional leaders for journalistic judgment, yet almost embrace the specialized "coaching" consultant. Arguments between the modern and traditional subcultures tend to take place at the policy level. For many anchors, though, especially those who feel thrown into modern television's emphasis on presentation, the coaching consultant has a lot to offer. The traditional subculture apparently does not meet their training needs in this area. The beautification trend is an

issue, but consultants did not always draw criticism for their emphasis on appearances. Most significant from the standpoint of the cultural network is the emergence of consultant coaches as allies. Outsiders or not, they seem to be filling a need for many anchors, who say they've had no training in a primary aspect of their job from inside the subculture.

### Rites and Rituals

Traditional rites and rituals for journalists test a newcomer's toughness and masculine abilities. The modern ritual of coaching, though, requires a completely different mindset: instead of standing for hours in the rain outside a courthouse, anchors are required to skillfully apply pancake makeup. Once again, the consultant's work reflects modern television's emphasis on beauty. For anchors with a traditional predisposition, it can be very difficult to accommodate this new requirement. In this section of the interview, anchors were expected to resent their need to be attractive, that they worry about their looks more than they'd like. The group was expected to feel dehumanized by beautification. While some were, the interviews indicate that modern television's demands are here to stay, and

rather than fight them, as traditionalism would dictate, anchors are quite likely compromise in order to survive.

### Personal Appearance

Just as in the previous section, the traditionalist stance, even though it seems to favor anchors, appears to be losing ground. Anchors were surprisingly unified in their answers to "How important is appearance to your job?" Not one person in the sample said it was "unimportant" or "a little important," the traditionalist's expected response[TABLE 16]. Instead, the grand majority said it was "very important" or "important." Only a few anchors said appearance was "too" important. But while they all agreed appearance was important to varying degrees, the anchors in the study didn't seem to be bothered by its significance. Less than a third of the group worried about looks. The majority said appearance was an insignificant worry, or that they did not worry about it at all[TABLE 17]. As mentioned earlier, some anchors said they'd experienced racism, or sexism, but this section will separate these issues from the discussion of beautification.

TABLE 16

## HOW IMPORTANT IS APPEARANCE TO YOUR JOB?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
VERY IMPORTANT	30	44.8
IMPORTANT	31	46.3
TOO IMPORTANT	6	9.0
	1	(MISSING)
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

TABLE 17

## HOW MUCH TO YOU WORRY ABOUT YOUR APPEARANCE?

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
SIGNIFICANTLY	19	28.4
INSIGNIFICANTLY	39	58.2
NOT AT ALL	9	13.4
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

It's possible that traditional admonishments against reporters worrying about cosmetics is what keeps them from getting ulcers over their hair or blemishes. But the interviews reflect another possibility: perhaps anchors don't worry about their looks because few have had negative experiences with beautification. A majority of the anchors, when asked "What effect have your looks had on your career?" responded that their appearance had a positive effect. A few anchors said their appearance had a negative effect,

a few percent said the effect was mixed, and a few more said their appearance had no effect. Some said they simply didn't know[TABLE 18].

TABLE 18  
ANCHORS' IMPRESSIONS OF THE IMPACT  
THEIR APPEARANCE HAS HAD ON THEIR CAREERS

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
MIXED	4	6.0
YES	39	58.2
NONE	13	19.4
DON'T KNOW	6	9.0
FOR WORSE	5	7.5
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

A frequent comment about the importance of appearance was that anchors cannot be extreme in either direction. Dick Clay, sports anchor for KAIT in Jonesboro, Arkansas, said he could not succeed if he were a "pretty boy"[59]. Tomi Jo Taylor believed her extremely good looks probably helped and hurt her somewhat in her job at KEY in El Centro, California. A former beauty queen, Taylor said, "People ask 'What else can she do?'"[60]. Liz Walker, speaking from WBZ in Boston, said this middle ground is not a dehumanizing "mold," but a communication necessity. "It's important for me to look nice, so (the viewers) feel comfortable with me," she says, "but that doesn't mean you have to look any one way."

There are some undercurrents of dehumanization, however; enough, perhaps, to give traditionalists reason to question the justice of modern television. Elizabeth Long, starting her career at WLIO in Lima, Ohio, reported that a Toledo news director told her one reason she couldn't work in his station was that she was "too young-looking"[61]. For Susan Alderman, working for small-market station WPTA, youthful looks were not what kept her from getting a job in Indianapolis. According to the grapevine, she said, it was her hair color. Alderman is a brunette; the station apparently wanted, and hired, a blonde[62].

In describing the importance of their looks the anchors often sounded like teenagers being set up for a blind date; unwilling to admit that face is a factor. Randy Meier of WKBT explained, "No matter how must people say 'it doesn't matter,' it does...People out there...just go for the exterior appearance. The better-looking man, all other things equal, will get the job"[63].

Ellen Maynard of WMAZ explained this observation by reasoning that an anchor's looks are all the audience knows. "They don't see the other eight-and-a-half to nine hours" of her workday[64]. Kathy Smith in Portland made regional news by dying her brunette hair blonde. After going on the air with her new hair color the first time, KGW received 51

phone calls in one hour. Her hair, apparently, had become part of the public domain. She wasn't bothered by it, however; she was considering doing it again at the time of her interview[65].

While a number of anchors reported worrying about one aspect of their appearance (Ken Schwall of WBIR said he's on a "perpetual diet" [66]) none of them said concern about their appearance caused them discomfort. Cindi Brucato's response reflects the survivalist's approach: says she's paid to worry about her appearance[67].

To accept the importance of appearance, however, does not necessarily mean all anchors are happy about it. There were plenty of complaints reflecting traditional views. WFIE's Rick Notter said he was frustrated watching good-looking journalists with little experience or substance advance quickly[68]. In St. Louis, Kim Hindrew of KTVI had an argument with her news director one evening after she didn't wear makeup for a newsbreak. She asked what he'd prefer she do when deadline pressure mounted: get on the air or put makeup on? She said her boss did not answer[69].

Kathy Brock, at Salt Lake City's KUTV, said content has priority. When time forces her to choose between going over a script and checking her face in the mirror, she chooses to rehearse[70]. Bill Harris, in Flint, Michigan, agreed.



"When all hell breaks loose, we don't even give any thought to 'What do I look like?'"[71]. Amye Brandli, in Lexington, Kentucky, proudly claimed that her ability to command attention had more of an effect on her career than her looks[72]. In Utica, New York, Bill Carroll approached the subject with a sense of humor, putting himself in the public's place, and asking the mirror, "If I were a viewer at home, would I want to look at this for a half-hour?"[73].

### On Being Oneself

In light of many complaints found in the literature that anchors had to fill a mold, the author expected some anchors in the sample to claim they could not be themselves. Not a single subject said so. Everyone said they could at least "be themselves to a point"[TABLE 19]. The portion who felt they had to temper themselves did not feel uncomfortable with the persona they projected. Brie Walker, for instance, said she only had to keep her ribald sense of humor off the set[74]. Some of the anchors said they "must be" themselves in order to succeed. "The people see you as if you're naked," explained Bob Koop of WIVB, Buffalo, "They can see through a phony"[75]. To the question, "Are you yourself?" only one person said "no." The rest said they were either themselves or again, a "slightly tempered" self with which they felt comfortable[TABLE 20].

TABLE 19

## CAN ANCHORS BE THEMSELVES?

---

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
YES	43	65.2
MUST BE	7	10.6
TO A POINT	16	24.2
NO ANSWER	1	(MISSING)
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0
VALID CASES	66	MISSING CASES 1

---

TABLE 20

BREAKDOWN OF ANCHORS WHO BELIEVE THEY  
ARE THEMSELVES ON THE AIR

---

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
YES	50	75.8
TO A POINT	15	22.7
NO	1	1.5
NO ANSWER	1	(MISSING)
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0
VALID CASES	66	MISSING CASES 1

---

Quite a few of the anchors interviewed saw "being oneself" as an ideal; something to work toward. After a year behind the anchor desk in Madison, WKBT's Randy Meier said, "It takes time to develop a personality out there...initially it doesn't come out"[76]. WVEC's Jane

Gardner of New Hampton, Virginia, has had more experience, and remarked, "I'm more willing to take chances with 'me'. I no longer feel I have to play a role"[77]. Amye Brandli of WLEX in Lexington had not yet reached her objective in this area: "It's something I strive for...I seem different in person than on camera"[78]. In a sense, this goal of naturalness can be interpreted as a traditionalist response. Rather than trying to learn how to be an "anchor" these respondents said they were trying to learn how to be real people.

This goal is shared by the consultant coaches represented in this study, all of whom denied any necessity to fill a prescribed role. Magid Communication Specialist Kris Hofacker said she sometimes must prove to anchors that there is more than one way for a person to deliver the news[79]. Peter Vissar, Bridgeport's anchor and news director, saw the same attitude among other anchors. "The problem with young people," he said, "...is they come off contrived. They feel they have to be someone else"[80].

Consultants consider their work to be helpful in teaching anchors to be themselves, and as seen in the preceding section, many anchors do find their advice helpful. But some anchors take a hardline traditionalist position. Don Johnson of KTVI, St. Louis, said he went to

Magid's headquarters in Marion to "learn to be natural," and that the concept is ridiculous. "Everybody has to find their own way." He felt comfortable with the persona he developed for anchoring. The only difference on and off camera was that he toned down his profanity on the air[81].

Another faction of the subjects argued that the demands of the job make it impossible for anchors to be completely themselves. "You try to be as conversational as possible," said WMAZ's Ellen Maynard, "but nobody talks like that"[82].

"You don't burp on the air," said Jackquie Walker of WIVB in Buffalo, and added that she felt like herself behind the anchor desk. "But then," she said, "how much can you be yourself when you're reading about the Pope getting shot?"[83].

Some anchors said that being oneself is not necessarily ideal. "If you tend to be yourself, you'll probably be dull," explained Gary Roedemeir of WHAS in Louisville, "If I was going to be myself on the air, I don't think I'd smile as much...it's almost like theater. You have to put the mask on every night. You have to appear interested in the news. The audience doesn't care if you have a cold or not"[84]. The lone dissenter to "Are you yourself?" was WTHI news director Greg Baker, who said, "People don't want me to be myself, they want to hear the news"[85].

### Summary

Ironically, the line between accepting and resenting modern rites and rituals seems to be drawn by a traditionalist pen. That is, when an anchor perceives that their "true" self is allowed on the air, or that the persona they project is somehow honest, they feel at ease with the demands on their appearance. Anchors who come across as contrived were viewed negatively. The expectation that anchors feel forced into a "mold," it seems, was quashed by the interviews.

Do anchors feel dehumanized by this cosmetic demand? Few of them worried about their appearance to uncomfortable degrees, yet they often sensed that the audience worries about it too much. Their complaints would be unwarranted if they were full-fledged movie stars; but traditional journalistic dogma gives their discomfort credence. The idealists in the group felt disappointed when a viewer called to comment on their hairstyle; the rest took it as a matter of course. On qualities they can do nothing about, such as race, sex and age, anchor worries were more frequent. Traditionalists might argue this is the fault of the modern television subculture's beautification of the industry; but discrimination existed long before then. It is significant that so many of the anchors surveyed accept

modern television's emphasis on beauty, and its inevitable manifestation as discrimination. Indeed, on this point, the very core of their subculture seems to be changing form for television journalists.

### Values

With the consultants' cosmetic influence on news presentation coming into conflict with traditional news values, it's possible that anchors might suffer from internal confusion or frustration with their jobs. Subjects were expected to complain about a betrayal of a traditional reverence for honesty and accuracy. The anchor's role as a stylized performer was expected to feel somehow ill-fitted for television journalists. This does not seem to be true from the material gathered for this survey. A perceived overemphasis on style over content was occasionally named as a source for irritation on the job, but not nearly as often as expected. Consultants, as representatives of the modern television subculture, were expected to draw criticism for their role in creating the anchors' performer role; this expectation, again, was not met to the degree predicted. Once again, the need to survive in the business seems to have led many of the people interviewed to compromise; sometimes uncomfortably, but not always.

### Job Satisfaction

An overwhelming majority of the anchors interviewed said they were either satisfied with their jobs or satisfied with some minor complaints. One detriment cited often by the "satisfied-but" respondents was a desire to move up to a better market. Another frequent drawback mentioned was the impact of the job on an anchor's family life; this was reported by men and women. Overall, though, the responses were variations on this one from a midwest anchor who requested anonymity for this study: "I enjoy anchoring...plus anchors are paid handsomely, and that's something you don't turn away lightly." Rarely did those who were dissatisfied mention a reason that reflects a conflict with modern television values[TABLE 21].

TABLE 21

#### ANCHORS' JOB SATISFACTION

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
YES	42	62.7
YES BUT	22	32.8
NO	3	4.5
	1	(MISSING)
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0
VALID CASES	67	

In response to "If you could change one thing about your job, what would it be?" day-to-day factors were mentioned most often: higher salaries, better equipment, or different hours[TABLE 22]. The veteran anchors seemed especially tired of working nights year after year. The next most-frequently given answer was nothing, while a few anchors said they'd like to work under more sympathetic management. A significant portion of the group reported wanting more control the whole operation. The latter response was the only one that could be interpreted as a reflection of the traditional to modern transition. These anchors, perhaps, were hoping to give journalists with traditional standards, more influence on their occupational surroundings.

TABLE 22

WHAT ANCHORS WOULD LIKE TO  
CHANGE ABOUT THEIR JOBS

		FREQUENCY	PERCENT
MORE INPUT		11	16.7
MECHANICS		23	34.8
MANAGEMENT		5	7.6
OTHER		12	18.2
NOTHING		15	22.7
		1	(MISSING)
TOTAL		67	100.0
VALID CASES	66	MISSING CASES	2



Sounding a similar theme, a number of anchors expressed the wish to be more like traditional journalism's heroes. Ellen Maynard of WMAZ in Macon, Georgia said she was satisfied with her career, but would rather be a reporter. Unfortunately, she said, the anchors make all the money[86]. Karen Harth of WNEP also missed reporting: "I get tired of being stuck in this building"[87].

KTVI's Larry Connors of St. Louis said he feels so far removed that he's ready to ask for more control over the content of his newscasts as part of his next contract[88]. In Jonesboro, Arkansas, Jack Hill of KAIT remarked that for him, anchoring is a trade-off; that after all these years, he has nothing to show for his work on the air. His big wish would be to win a million dollars and do nothing but in-depth reports on his own[89].

A significant number of the answers to the question, "What would you change?" could not be easily categorized for the content analysis and were marked in the "other" column. Sexism and ageism were some of these "other" responses. A few female anchors were satisfied but worried about the effect their age will have on their careers. Jane Gardner, WVEC, said she "may only have a few years left," at age 33[90]. Denise Boyer, from WRAL in Raleigh, North Carolina, said "I'd like to feel I could grey in this business," but

wasn't sure it was possible[91]. Charlie Swank, anchor and news director of WHIZ in Zanesville, Ohio, disliked having to compete for ratings. He said, "I'd rather do my job and get it over with"[92].

### Attitude Changes

If the role of anchors within news culture is changing, then the subjects could be expected to report a contrast between what they expected when they entered the business and the reality they've experienced. When answering the question, "How have your attitudes about the job changed since you started?" this prediction is supported, although not overwhelmingly so. Some of the subjects said they were less naive now than when they started. Only three people, however, actually said they were disillusioned. Another small segment said that their attitudes had not changed at all[TABLE 23]. Many anchors found that their jobs had more of an impact on their community than they expected.

TABLE 23

#### CHANGES IN ANCHORS' ATTITUDES

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
LESS NAIVE	14	20.9
MORE AWARE	16	23.9
UNHAPPY	3	4.5
OTHER	5	7.5
NO ANSWER	29	43.3
	-----	-----
TOTAL	67	100.0

Steve Dunn of WILX considered himself among the more cynical. "When I used to watch TV, I used to think it was a real serious business. Now I know it's a lot more theatrical, and now management is so concerned with money, the fun is gone." Dunn said he isn't ready to leave, though; even with its problems the job is more rewarding than being "a salesman"[93]. In Utica, New York, WKTV's Bill Worden said he's let go of some of his traditional subcultural views and doesn't regret it a bit. "When I first got into television, I was as pure as the driven snow," he explained, adding that had he had kept that attitude, he'd "bore people to death"[94]. After a phenomenal forty-two years in broadcasting, Jim Davis of WAGT, Augusta, Georgia, said simply, "All my lances have been broken"[95].

Weekend anchor Don Johnson of KTVI in St. Louis, who is black, was among those reporting no change in attitude, but said it's because "I'm a natural cynic, so there was nothing to go sour. I didn't come in a bright-eyed neophyte." Johnson said he found racism and sexism in the television industry, and attributed his blackness to the fact that, after five years, he was still anchoring weekends instead of working a prestigious weeknight spot. He seems angry, but not ready to give up[96].

Charlie Zewe of WDSU in New Orleans, was one of the anchors who felt the weight of the job more heavily than when he started. "I'm more careful today about facts," he said, "...the potential for abuse (in television news) is horrendous. It's really scary"[97]. In Evansville, Indiana, WFIE's Rick Notter, said "I try to pay much more attention to details"[98]. Elizabeth Long of Lima, Ohio's WLIO, seemed to be an example of the young people so many of the traditionalists complain about. After only about a year working in a small market, she found the job is not what she expected. "I now know you've got to work harder. Now I'm deciding whether I want to go on...I know now I'll really have to work hard"[99]. In this respect, the modern television subculture may not be all that different from the traditional one.

#### A Sense of Purpose

As discussed earlier, traditional journalistic values dictate that a journalist's duty is to the public. Beautification might have some believe that the duty of modern anchors is to entertain; commercialism would indicate their role is to produce profit. A few anchors in the survey addressed the question "What is the purpose of a local television news operation?" on this philosophical level, the type of response predicted. Subjects were

expected to talk about the differences between what they believed the public needs to know and what it wants to know; to complain about the intrusion of beautification, commercialization and dehumanization into their daily routines. The prediction was borne out to a certain extent, but many anchors brought up ideas that were not expected, most notably, a news operation's potential for community involvement. In fact, answers to this question were so diverse that it was pointless to tally them.

Bruce Aune, WILX, shared his definition of news in his response: "We'll always be a headline service...to bring the news to the public. The news is anything that's happening that's of interest to the viewer"[100]. Steve Dunn of the same station said a local television news operation should be to inform, but is (in his words, "unfortunately") to make money[101]. Demetria Kalademos of WSMV adheres to the idea that a station must serve the public when she says a station must "give them (the audience) enough information ..so they can make a change if they'd like to"[102].

Kathy Brock of KUTV in Salt Lake City balanced it out this way: "The bottom line is money...but you have to be conscientious"[103]. Traditional values acknowledge the need for a news organization to be financially viable while

drawing a sharp line between journalists and the revenue earning members of a news organization. Some of the anchors in the sample openly recognized their role in blurring this line; the rest did not mention it. Those who realized their profit-making role seemed to feel it was a problem they could cope with.

Apparently, the changes within the subculture have wrought enough conflict to make some anchors uncomfortable; but modern television's rewards for anchoring may offset the frustrations felt by traditional idealists. The rewards mentioned included both tangibles, such as a good salary, and intangibles, such as a sense of duty to the public. A good many anchors mentioned their station's potential for community service[104]. Traditional values would dictate that journalists must be impartial observers. Yet these anchors felt they'd been transformed into unelected community leaders of sorts, who had to participate positively in society. This new value on community service, while conflicting with tradition, seems morally "positive" enough to compensate for the other values compromised in modern television.

### Style and Substance

The interviews indicate that each anchor strikes a balance between style and substance in his or her own way. Some freely discuss what they call the "show business" part of the work. Others, apparently holding deep traditional values, use the word "show business" to connote anything that is evil in journalism. The word "style" on the other hand, was not as controversial. Journalists seem to consider it acceptable to adopt a performance "style," as long as the adaptation is not called "acting." The precision with which they use these terms could indicate that for anchors, this is a touchy subject.

The majority of those interviewed said that "news" or "content" comprises the bulk of their work, and outweighs stylistic considerations. The common answer was that the job has a sixty-forty split, with sixty percent of the job involving "news"[TABLE 24]. Gordon Peterson in Washington D.C. might consider himself a traditionalist, and said for him, anchoring is ninety percent news. "I'm also a performer," he added, "but if you know what you're talking about, you don't have to think about performing"[105]. Another strong news advocate, Don Johnson of KTVI, said the job is eighty-five percent news for him, "because I insist on that," but that the rest of the industry has more of a sixty-forty split[106].

TABLE 24

## ANCHORS' BREAKDOWN OF THE JOB;

## NEWS VERSUS SHOW BUSINESS

	FREQUENCY	PERCENT	
75% OR MORE IS NEWS	2	35.4	
51-74% IS NEWS	14	21.5	
50% IS NEWS	13	20.0	
0-49% IS NEWS	6	9.2	
INSEPARABLE	9	13.8	
NO ANSWER	2	(MISSING)	
	-----	-----	
TOTAL	67	100.0	
VALID CASES	65	MISSING CASES	2

Some of those in the majority had the news content set all the way down to fifty-one percent. Part of the sample said news comprised only half their job. A few said news was outweighed by style. Rick Notter of WFIE was one of these. He said, "Content is very important, but the way you present it is just as important"[107]. Bruce Aune of WILX blamed consultants for the increasing emphasis on style. He commented that he "would like to think (the job) is strongly journalism...but it's not"[108]. Speaking from Oklahoma City, Jack Bowen was less apologetic: "The purists...think the more ancient you are the better your journalism. Packaging has a lot to do with stuff"[109]. Some anchors, such as Greg Baker, resisted splitting the two functions: "If a person draws a line between show business and



journalism," he warned, "then that person is probably doing a bad job at both."

Interestingly, those anchors who were in the minority, who felt that style outweighed content, were usually not apologetic about their responses. For those who took a more traditionalist stance, even admitting that show business may be even a small part of their job was painful. The line between the traditionalists and the moderns is bold here. Even so, those who might call themselves traditionalists might disappoint Edward R. Murrow should he suddenly return to life. For one anchor to declare that you "have to have a solid sixty percent journalism," in this survey sounded a bit on the old-fashioned side[110]. Murrow and his boys, however, might not consider sixty percent to be all that solid.

### Summary

The modern television subculture challenges many traditional journalistic values. This section of the interview was designed to find out whether anchors feel frustration as they try to formulate a new subcultural value system. They were expected to express a feelings of role confusion and job dissatisfaction, yet did not report these feelings to a great degree.

Dissatisfaction on the job was blamed more often on technical factors, such as salary or hours; not ethical discomfort. There was a minor amount of disillusionment. Perhaps because traditionally, journalists are taught to be cynics, they've applied this attitude to their own commercialization, dehumanization and beautification. The anchors surveyed did not have a common vocabulary for their sense of purpose. This would indicate they are having some confusion, albeit subconscious confusion, about what their job is all about. Few questioned the idea that show business is part of what their job is all about, yet most agreed that content still had priority.

A non-traditional idea is introduced in this section of the interviews: anchors often brought up their role as community leaders. Apparently, they are aware of a certain amount of power in society, and see its potential for doing good. Their discussions of this phenomenon went beyond traditional muckraking reporting; they were talking about getting out into the community, participating in community events, being outright advocates for local spirit. It could be theorized that this is why so many are comfortable with the compromises made in traditional values by the modern television subculture: that this trade-off allows television journalists a sense of moral righteousness in their daily activities.

### Summary

The interviews conducted for this thesis yielded a number of surprising "little truths" to consider. The literature examined in previous chapters would lead one to believe that traditional news culture is quite favorable to journalists, and modern television, with its tendency toward commercialization, dehumanization and beautification, is something journalists would want to reject. This is not always the case for the local television anchors interviewed.

Sometimes the line between accepting and rejecting modern subculture tenets often was drawn on the basis of truth; the almighty traditional value. For instance, regarding the promotions that are now part of their everyday environment, anchors seem more willing to go along with the system if the promotions about them seem "truthful." More often, the deciding factor seemed to be an anchor's desire to survive in the business. Many anchors say modern television's demands are just "part of the job," and believe fighting those demands as naive. Christine Craft, instead of becoming a new subcultural heroine, is often denounced as a misguided idealist.

Anchors perceptions of the consultant's role in modern television also yielded some surprises. Instead of being criticized, consultants, more specifically consultant-coaches, are seen as an anchor's new allies. This is especially ironic in face of the fact that, as Kris Hofacker points out, a consultant's client is the station, not the anchor[111]. But because modern television demands skills not traditionally taught, consultant-coaches have come to be valued by journalists.

Subcultural values do not seem to have changed so sharply that anchors have abandoned their traditional duty to the public. Instead of finding problems with their role as consumer products, they seem to want to be conscientious products. That is, while they're being sold as celebrities, they have come to see themselves as a new kind of community leader. The traditional stance of journalist as observer only is apparently eroding; the activist reporter is taking over. Perhaps the rewards of this role are what sooth an anchor's ethical conscience when faced with the need to compromise tradition in order to survive modern television's demands.

"There is a little bit of show biz  
involved in a newscast...but we've go  
to communicate on this damn thing."

Ray Depa  
News Director  
KETV Omaha

## ENDNOTES

1. Don Johnson, Telephone Interview, 16 February 1985.
2. Powers, p. 184.
3. Dennis Bounds, Telephone Interview, 10 November 1984.
4. Jane Gardner, Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.
5. Susan Alderman, Telephone Interview, 21 February 1985.
6. Gordon Peterson, Telephone Interview, 7 March 1985.
7. Demetria Kalademos, Telephone Interview, 14 January 1985.
8. Charlie Swank, Telephone Interview, 15 November 1984.
9. Jack Bowen, Telephone Interview, 14 January 1985.
10. Keith Edwards, Telephone Interview, 21 January 1985.
11. Karen Harth, Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.
12. Larry Johnson, Telephone Interview, 11 March 1985.
13. Bob Koop, Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.
14. Claudia Barr, Telephone Interview, 5 March 1985.
15. Tomi Jo Taylor, Telephone Interview, 14 November 1984.
16. Ellen Maynard, Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.
17. Larry Hunter, Telephone Interview, 21 January 1985.

18. Sandy Arnn, Telephone Interview, 16 February 1985.
19. Jim Rennick, Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985; In New Hampton, Virginia, WVEC's Jane Gardner tries to convince those who attend her public speaking engagements about the time she was sent out to cover a "Blackbird Exorcism" at the local city park. The wooded area was overrun with blackbirds that summer, and a man had called a news conference to demonstrate how he would get rid of the creatures with a magical spell (Gardner does not explain why the local media took the man seriously). It was a nighttime story, and Gardner says she had to carry an umbrella to protect herself and her photographer from the birds' waste. "This is glamour?" she asks.
20. Ken Schwall, Telephone Interview, 17 March 1985.
21. Kathy Brock, Telephone Interview, 6 March 1985.
22. Lisa Koseoglu, Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.
23. Koop, Telephone Interview.
24. Marlene Schneider, Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.
25. Gardner, Telephone Interview.
26. Lynne Gansar, Telephone Interview, 25 February 1985.
27. Kalademos, Telephone Interview.
28. Jacquie Walker, Telephone Interview, 31 January 1985.
29. Randy Meier, Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.
30. David James, Telephone Interview, 16 January 1985.
31. Rick Notter, Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.
32. Lynne Scarborough says female viewers are also more critical of female anchors than men are. (See Smith, "TV Newswoman's Suit Stirs Debate on Values in Hiring," sec. 1, p. 1.)

33. Elizabeth Long, Telephone Interview, 12 March 1985.
34. Taylor, Telephone Interview.
35. Vicki Kennedy, Telephone Interview, 14 January 1985.
36. Cindi Brucato, Telephone Interview, 26 February 1985.
37. Rennick, Telephone Interview.
38. Brandon Brooks, Telephone Interview, 15 February 1985.
39. Larry Johnson, Telephone Interview.
40. Tina Hicks, Telephone Interview, 14 February 1985.
41. Ray Miller, "Show Business Has No Business in the News Business," p. 84.
42. Greg Baker, Telephone Interview, 10 November 1984.
43. Liz Walker, Telephone Interview, 5 March 1985.
44. Maynard, Telephone Interview.
45. Harth, Telephone Interview.
46. James, Telephone Interview.
47. Bowen, Telephone Interview.
48. Amye Brandli, Telephone Interview, 4 March 1985.
49. Larry Johnson, Telephone Interview.
50. Larry Conners, Telephone Interview, 30 January 1985.
51. Peterson, Telephone Interview.
52. Steve Dunn, Telephone Interview, 17 March 1985.
53. Peter Vissar, Telephone Interview, 14 November 1984.



54. Dunn, Telephone Interview.
55. Gansar, Telephone Interview.
56. James, Telephone Interview.
57. Edwards, Telephone Interview.
58. Tape-recorded seminar held during the 1984 Radio-Television News Directors Association San Antonio convention. Discussion participants included Jim Topping, a news director at KTRK, Spence Kinard, a news director from KSL in Salt Lake City, Eric Huguelet from the Atkinson and Faulder Research consulting firm in Atlanta, and Lynne Scarborough, from Audience Research and Development in Dallas.
59. Dick Clay, Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.
60. Taylor, Telephone Interview.
61. Long, Telephone Interview.
62. Alderman, Telephone Interview.
63. Meier, Telephone Interview.
64. Maynard, Telephone Interview.
65. Kathy Smith, Telephone Interview, 21 January 1985.
66. Schwall, Telephone Interview.
67. Brucato, Telephone Interview.
68. Notter, Telephone Interview.
69. Kim Hindrew, Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.
70. Brock, Telephone Interview.
71. Bill Harris, Telephone Interview, 23 January 1985.
72. Brandli, Telephone Interview.
73. Bill Carroll, Telephone Interview, 6 March 1985.
74. Brie Walker, Telephone Interview, 14 February 1985; Brie Walker's name came onto the survey list for this papers research by chance. Her case is quite interesting,

because throughout her interview, Walker, who works for KGTV in San Diego, never once brought up her physical condition; she says she crossed over from radio to television when the business "opened up for women." According to Howard Rosenberg however ("Anchorwoman Beats Odds for Right to Fight Nielsen," The Rocky Mountain News, 4 February 1984, p. 88), there's a lot more to her story.

She didn't mention that years ago, her agent told her to just forget a job in television, that she was just setting herself up for rejection if she tried. Not once did she mention the fact that she suffers from syndactylism: she has webbed hands and feet. Her hands are, in one reporters words, "incomplete, gnarled and stumpy." When she started reporting at KGTV, she wore prosthetic gloves for a few weeks, until her boss told her to throw them away.

When asked one of the questions included in this part of the interview, "What effect do you think your appearance has had on your career?" Walker answered, "Very positive. If someone doesn't have all the steps for grooming or looking good, they're not going to get ahead as fast." The reporter who wrote of her deformed hands also described Walker as a "bright, stunning blonde." She told that reporter, "If I was a real dog, even if I had good hands, I wouldn't be on the air."

75. Bob Koop, Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.

76. Meier, Telephone Interview.

77. Gardner, Telephone Interview.

78. Brandli, Telephone Interview.

79. Visit made by the author to Frank Magid and Associates in Marion, Iowa, 28 February 1984. Three people were interviewed: Dan Wilch, a "communication specialist," Kris Hofacker, his supervisor, and Steve Ridge, the corporation's vice president in charge of television consultation. Frank Magid and Associates gave the author a complete tour of the facilities and spent several hours answering questions.

80. Vissar, Telephone Interview.

81. Don Johnson, Telephone Interview.

82. Maynard, Telephone Interview.
83. Jacquie Walker, Telephone Interview.
84. Gary Roedemeir, Telephone Interview, 15 January 1985.
85. Baker, Telephone Interview.
86. Maynard, Telephone Interview.
87. Harth, Telephone Interview.
88. Conners, Telephone Interview.
89. Jack Hill, Telephone Interview, 21 January 1985.
90. Gardner, Telephone Interview.
91. Denise Boyer, Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.
92. Swank, Telephone Interview.
93. Dunn, Telephone Interview.
94. Bill Worden, Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.
95. Jim Davis, Telephone Interview, 4 March 1985.
96. Johnson, Telephone Interview.
97. Charlie Zewe, Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.
98. Notter, Telephone Interview.
99. Long, Telephone Interview.
100. Bruce Aune, Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.
101. Dunn, Telephone Interview.
102. Kalademos, Telephone Interview.
103. Brock, Telephone Interview.
104. Kalademos, Telephone Interview.

- 105. Peterson, Telephone Interview.
- 106. Don Johnson, Telephone Interview.
- 107. Notter, Telephone Interview.
- 108. Aune, Telephone Interview.
- 109. Bowen, Telephone Interview.
- 110. Carroll, Telephone Interview.
- 111. Visit to Frank Magid and Associates.

## CHAPTER VI

### CONCLUSION

"We are not just journalists, " said Tomi Jo Taylor, one of the youngest anchors interviewed for this study[1]. An analysis of the modern television subculture, and the role played by local news anchors within that subculture, indicates that she's absolutely right. Modern local anchors are consumer products, entertainers, community leaders and news reporters all in one human being. They are playing a role fraught with paradox: how can one person be of service to the public while being sold to the public? It would seem impossible for individual anchors to be able to combine these two functions comfortably. Yet interviews conducted for this study indicate that many television journalists are able to do so, often with great success.

The introduction to this thesis posed a question:

How do television news anchors perceive their role as journalists within their occupational subculture as it is influenced by the presence of station consultants?

To explore this question, the author examined the occupational subculture inhabited by television anchors from before and after the mid-1960s. The subcultural analysis used Deal and Kennedy's outline, breaking down its components into the environment, heroes, the cultural network, rites and rituals, and subcultural values.

As noted earlier in this thesis, the traditional news subculture has a very masculine aura. The environment is fast paced and highly competitive. Edward R. Murrow, the traditional broadcast hero, embodied the ideals of this era, and folklore about Murrow, and other cultural knowledge, was passed from generation to generation within newsrooms. Editor taught reporter who taught cub reporter. The "cubs" learned that to become a valued member of the traditional subculture, they had to be tough, and "pay their dues," often by scooping the competition or taking on difficult, dirty assignments. Through it all, their inspiration was an unwavering belief that as journalists, they owed something to the public: the whole truth. The gritty, sometimes vulgar atmosphere of traditional newsrooms was excusable because it was honest.

Chapter III analyzed what has occurred in the journalistic subculture since about 1962, the year this thesis has chosen to mark the beginning of the modern

television news subculture. Each of the components of subculture have been touched by three overlapping trends, namely, beautification, commercialization and dehumanization. The subcultural environment, spurred on by a rapidly growing audience, became much more competitive; not for scoops, however, but for ratings points. As stations competed for the audience, their primary representatives, local news anchors, were transformed from down-to-earth reporters to media stars. Outside consultants, or "news marketing experts," appeared on the scene, ready to assist stations as they tried to sell these news "products." Consultants developed specialized research and coaching methods to teach anchors how to succeed in this new subculture, and carved a niche for themselves in the cultural network. Finally, as the ratings points took on greater importance, success of a newscast began to be measured not by its accuracy, speed or honesty; it was judged by an electronic "Black Box" operated by Neilson.

The thesis question concentrates on the perceptions anchors hold of their own role in this changing subculture. The author designed a qualitative research project to explore these perceptions through extended interviews. The goal of the research was to develop a hypothesis or hypotheses which could be further explored using quantitative techniques.

The interviews yielded some surprising observations. Most surprising was that anchors do not seem to have experienced the three modernization trends as negatively as predicted in Chapter IV. For instance, they are not as bothered by the dehumanizing development in the subcultural environment known as promotions as expected. They recognized, as one anchor put it, that they are sold like "toothpaste[2]," yet as long as they perceive their promotion's selling points as truthful, they tolerate the practice. Christine Craft, the woman who sued her former employer for fraud and sex discrimination, was expected to be the latest subcultural heroine for pointing out inequities that may evolve when anchors become consumer products. Yet she was damned as often as she was praised.

The role of consultants, representatives of the modern television subculture, is central to the thesis question. The anchors interviewed raised some interesting issues about the way consultants have changed their working lives. For instance, while anchors generally do not like station management to place more faith in outsiders than in the in-house staff, the anchors interviewed frequently reported having very positive experiences with consultants. Coaches, it seems, have become a welcome member of the subcultural network for many anchors, even though they may be outsiders. Apparently, anchors feel the need to acquire the skills that



coaches teach, and traditional sources cannot, or do not provide this training.

The interviews revealed a willingness to accept many changes in the anchors' occupational subculture. The impression is, in order to survive, certain things just have to be tolerated. The anchors interviewed soundly acknowledged the importance of their appearance to their job. Some, especially women and blacks, reported unhappiness with appearance standards; what might be considered discrimination. But many members of the group reported their appearance helped their careers, and those who complained were a minority. Because the traditional value system was strong and idealistic, attacks by the three modern trends were expected to cause a great deal of frustration and anger for anchors. Instead, their complaints about their jobs centered around the hours or pay. The interviews indicate that some of the losses by the traditional value system may be offset by the introduction of a new moral impetus for anchors; that as an emerging role of anchor as community leader.

The goal of the research was to derive a hypothesis which may be further researched quantitatively. In light of the interview findings, the following hypothesis is proposed:

If a viable news subculture exists for television journalists, then anchors will feel more positive about their work if they are trained in all skills, including style and performance, within that subculture.

This hypothesis draws on the material presented in this thesis. A quantitative study on this hypothesis should keep mind the findings of the interviews; for instance, the phenomenon of consultants becoming allies because they alone teach skills necessary to survive in the modern television subculture. A number of other, more focused hypotheses might be drawn from the study. A variety of research projects are possible. For instance, a very valuable case study of the anchor-consultant relationship could be designed, guided by subcultural factors. This study could yield useful information for members of the television community. A time-based study would also be quite revealing; one which would measure anchors' occupational values and attitudes over the span of their careers.

"The plague of the consultants has come and gone. They have been replaced by a generation of clones who masquerade as news directors," complained a news director in 1980[3]. His comment is representative of the resentment subcultural "ins" feel toward the "outs" who force change. Change in and of itself, however, cannot be perceived as inherently evil. Ron Powers supports the idea that research is morally

neutral. In The Newscasters, he concludes that "the ultimate responsibility for the quality of a newscast, or a total station, lies not in the research but in the interpretation of and the way management uses it"[4].

As the interviews conducted for this paper reveal, management often uses consultants as the only source of stylistic leadership. Traditional news subculture has no tenets for coping with many of television's stylistic demands; the consultants, especially when coaching talent, have filled a void. Traditional news culture perspectives have come in conflict with some of the stylistic demands: the makeup, clothes and hairstyles an anchor must wear on the air. This results in a symbolic war between show business and news on a scale never before seen in American media.

And yet, as communicative techniques, the use of cameras, make-up and hair styles may be no more a sell-out to "show business" than the inverted pyramid writing style. What is done with make-up, hair style and cameras is what gives meaning to the television news message. Journalists might find it possible to pay attention to these factors responsibly, but only if the fine points of style are carefully examined and understood. Those who dismiss the importance of stylistic factors out of hand are missing the

point. The informational function of television news is betrayed by misuse of these style techniques, not by their mere use. Perhaps by paying attention to stylistic questions themselves, and not allowing sales executives to make such determinations, journalists will be able to fulfill their original mandate: to serve the public.

As the interviews have shown, television anchors recognize their role as products while seeing themselves as community leaders. This community activist role can provide satisfaction in a job whose subculture is otherwise fragmented. While this role may be rewarding, though, it could also backfire. After all, many stations promote their anchors as quality members of the community. Promotions provide potential for deceit, just as much as a TelePromTer allows a dingbat to read the news and come across intelligently.

To prevent deception, then, journalists must take back control of their jobs. Research for this thesis has found empirical studies by both consultants and scholars, which demonstrate that stylistic factors matter to the audience. Modern television journalism would be well-served if its participants paid attention to these studies and then responded actively. Perhaps instead of simply dismissing what consultants say as useless, traditional journalists

might accept the scientific findings. Instead of throwing their hands in the air and allowing the sales department to dictate their clothing and hair styles, the television journalists could take control. Consultants are teaching news directors how to coach talent. Perhaps the news directors could someday assume the consultants' role as stylistic adviser, while keeping their content-oriented role as journalistic adviser.

Dan Rather's mentor, Hugh Cunningham, taught the future "Pope" of CBS that "Nobody gives a s--- about you: you are NOT the story." Television journalists can no longer deny that they are part of the story. When a television anchor delivers a story, their "self" is much more intertwined with the story than is a newspaper reporter. The television audience gets a journalist's voice, body, and personality with the news, not just a byline. Viewers find it difficult to separate the messenger from the message. The only way out would be for anchors to wear paper bags over their heads. The disturbing message from some modern television messengers, though, is that they are more interested in hair spray than crime statistics. The promotional executives are using the same techniques to sell news as they do soap, and journalists let them do it.

In a stylistic code controlled by journalists, would make it possible for a reporter to appear at the scene of a tornado with imperfect hair. Someone with acne could deliver an investigative story. In a journalistic style code, anchors could declare themselves through words and action as journalists: not models or actors. News directors would teach the cubs what "look" is appropriate and what is not, and by doing so, they could hold on to the ideas that best serve society. Journalists might concede to research that dictates an anchor must wear a dark suit, but ignore the idea that anchors must be white males. Twentieth century American journalism has fought for its First Amendment rights armed with populist idealism. With the onset of modern television, journalists have betrayed themselves.

The three panelists who talked with RTNDA members in 1984 said that having an outsider coach talent is better because anchors take criticism from an outsider more easily. Yet anchors and reporters are expected to take criticism about their writing and journalistic abilities from a news director; why not on their appearance? The panelists may have been rationalizing their existence. They started their own undoing, in a sense, by going ahead and teaching news directors how to coach talent themselves. Journalists in the study who expressed feelings of disillusionment would

generally say they were not prepared for the stylistic emphasis their job entails, the things one anchor called, "what they don't teach you in journalism school." Today, perhaps, these things need to be taught in journalism school.

If journalists are to take back control of their jobs, as many of the ones interviewed for this paper say they want to, they will probably have to put style on the subcultural agenda. The traditionalists may see this as selling out, but the more militaristic among them could come to perceive it as a "counter-offensive" instead. Indeed, to give stylistic control to the consultants and sales executives by default is truly selling out; to be consoled by community involvement or heady salaries is selling out; to be reassured by ratings instead of a conscience is truly selling out. Willy Loman was not killed by the emptiness of the American businessworld. He killed himself when he only recognized that emptiness when it was too late. Unfortunately, unless television anchors learn to recognize emptiness when it occurs in their own lives, the public will be victimized as well.

#### ENDNOTES

1. Taylor, Telephone Interview.
2. Bounds, Telephone Interview.
3. Barrett and Sklar, p. 60.
4. Powers, p. 161.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

"A Consultant Testifies in TV Co-Anchor Case," The New York Times. 4 August 1983, sec. 3, p. 19.

Alderman, Susan. Telephone Interview, 21 February 1985.

"America: Glued to the Tube." U.S. News and World Report, 6 February 1984, p. 9.

Amory, Cleveland. "What Walter Cronkite Misses Most." Parade Magazine, 11 March 1984, p. 4.

"Appeals Court Overturns \$325,000 Award to Craft." Des Moines Register, 29 June 1985, p. 3-A.

Arnn, Sandy. Telephone Interview, 16 February 1985.

Aune, Bruce. Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.

Avery, Robert. "Access and Ascertainment in Broadcasting: An Overview." Western Journal of Speech Communication, 41 (Summer 1977): 132.

Babbie, Earl. The Practice of Social Research. 2nd ed. Belmont, Cal.: Wadsworth Publishing, 1979.

Bantz, Charles R. "Television News: Reality and Research." Western Journal of Speech Communication, 39 (Spring 1975): 123.

Baker, Greg. Telephone Interview, 10 November 1984.

Barr, Claudia. Telephone Interview, 5 March 1985.

Barrett, Marvin, ed. Moments of Truth? New York:  
Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973.

Barrett, Marvin; Sklar, Zachary, ed. The Eye  
of the Storm. New York: Lippincott and  
Crowell, 1980.

Becker, Howard, et al. Boys in White: Student Culture  
in Medical School. Chicago: University of  
Chicago Press, 1961.

Bounds, Dennis. Telephone Interview, 10 November 1984.

Bowen, Jack. Telephone Interview, 14 January 1985.

Boyer, Denise. Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.

Brandli, Amye. Telephone Interview, 4 March 1985.

Broadcasting/Cablecasting Yearbook 1984. Washington, D.C:  
Broadcasting Publications, 1984.

Brock, Kathy. Telephone Interview, 6 March 1985.

Brooks, Brandon. Telephone Interview, 15 February 1985.

Brucato, Cindi. Telephone Interview, 26 February 1985.

Brucker, Herbert. Journalist: Eyewitness to History.  
London: Macmillan Company, 1962.

Bucher, Rue; Stelling, Joan. Becoming Professional.  
Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1977.

Carroll, Bill. Telephone Interview, 6 March 1985.

Cater, Hodding. "Inside Story." Public Television  
broadcast, 15 April 1984.

Caspar, Ronald; Hughes, Florence. "So-Called  
Heavy-Drinking Occupations: Two Empirical Tests."  
Journal of Studies on Alcohol, January 1982.  
pp. 110-18.

"Chips Off the New Clone" Ms. December 1984, p. 48.

Clay, Dick. Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.

Cole, Stephen. The Sociological Method: An Introduction  
to the Science of Sociology. 3rd ed., Chicago:  
Rand McNally, 1980.

Connors, Larry. Telephone Interview, 30 January 1985.

Craft, Christine. Interview, Des Moines, Iowa.  
8 February 1984.

Craft, Christine. "The Marketing of T.V. News:  
My Problem and Yours." Ms., November 1983,  
p. 134.

Davis, Jim. Telephone Interview, 4 March 1985.

Deal, Terrance; Kennedy, Allan. Corporate Cultures:  
The Rites and Rituals of Corporate Life.  
Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1982.

Gardner, Jane. Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.

Gilmore, Gene, and Root, Robert. "Ethics for Newsmen." In Ethics and the Press, ed. John C. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney. New York: Hastings House, 1978, p. 27.

Gordon, Raymond. Interviewing: Strategy, Techniques, and Tactics. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1969.

Harr, Candice. "A Study of Consulting Firms and Televisic Newsrooms." Masters Thesis, Iowa State University, 1974.

Harris, Bill. Telephone Interview, 23 January 1985.

Harth, Karen. Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.

Henley, Don. "Dirty Laundry." Asylum Records and Tapes, 1982.

Hicks, Tina. Telephone Interview, 14 February 1985.

Hill, Jack. Telephone Interview, 21 January 1985.

Hindrew, Kim. Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.

Holcomb, Betty. "Cooperating with the Consultants: Is It Naive to Be Candid?" Savvy. March 1984, p. 61.

Hunter, Larry. Telephone Interview, 21 January 1985.

Hutchinson, Kevin, "Effects of Newscaster Gender." Journal of Broadcasting 26 (Winter 1982): 457-67.

James, David. Telephone Interview, 16 January 1985.

Johnson, Don. Telephone Interview, 16 February 1985.

Johnson, Larry. Telephone Interview, 11 March 1985.

Johnstone, John W.C.; Slawski, Edward J.; and Bowman, William. The News People: A Sociological Portrait of American Journalists and Their Work. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1976.

Joseph, Ted. "Existing Decision-Making Practices at Local Television Stations." Psychological Reports, June 1982, pp. 895-98.

Kahn, Joseph P. "What's the Difference Between Politicia and Cottage Cheese?" Inc., March 1984, p. 68.

Kalademos, Demetria. Telephone Interview, 14 January 198

Kendrick, Alexander. Prime Time: The Life and Times of Edward R. Murrow. New York: Avon Books, 1969

Kennedy, Vicki. Telephone Interview, 14 January 1985.

Koop, Bob. Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.

Koseoglu, Lisa. Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.

Labowitz, Sanford. An Introduction to Sociological Concepts. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1977

Levy, Mark. "Experiencing Television News." Journal of Communication, Autumn 1977, pp. 112-17.

- Lewis, Carolyn D. Reporting for Television. New York: Columbia University Press, 1984.
- Light, Donald; Keller, Suzanne. Sociology. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1975.
- "Local News Blues." Newsweek 16 January 1978, p. 82.
- Long, Elizabeth. Telephone Interview, 12 March 1985.
- Lurie, Alison. The Language of Clothes. New York: Random House, 1983.
- McCall, George; Simmons, J.L. Issues in Participant Observation: A Text and Reader. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
- Malloy, John T. Dress for Success. New York: Warner Brothers: 1975.
- Matusow, Barbara. "Anchors Abroad." Channels, January-February 1985, pp. 41-43.
- Matusow, Barbara. The Evening Stars: The Making of A Network News Anchor, Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1983
- Maynard, Ellen. Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.
- Meier, Randy. Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.
- Mencher, Melvin. News Reporting and Writing. 2nd ed. Dubuque, Iowa: William C. Brown Publishers, 1977.
- Merrill, John C.; Barney, Ralph D., eds. Ethics and the Press. New York: Hastings House, 1978.

Metzler, Ken. Creative Interviewing: The Writer's Guide to Gathering Information by Asking Questions. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Miller, Arthur. Death of a Salesman. New York: Viking Press, 1977.

Miller, Ray. "KPRC's Ray Miller: Show Business has No Business in the News Business." Broadcasting, 9 May 1977, p. 84.

"Mi\$\$fortune." The Times Delphic (Des Moines: Drake University), 14 February 1984, p. 4.

Murphy, Steve, Telephone Interview, 18 February 1984.

Notter, Rick. Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.

Novack, Michael, "Notes on the Drama of Politics and the Drama of Journalism." In The Politics of Broadcasting: The Alfred I. duPont Foundation Survey of Broadcast Journalism, 1971-2. Edited by Marvin Barrett. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1972.

Novack, Michael, "The People and the News." In Moments of Truth: The Fifth Alfred I. duPont Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism. Edited by Marvin Barrett. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973.

Metzler, Ken. Creative Interviewing: The Writer's Guide to Gathering Information by Asking Questions. Englewood Cliffs, N.J: Prentice Hall, 1977.

Miller, Arthur. Death of a Salesman. New York: Viking Press, 1977.

Miller, Ray. "KPRC's Ray Miller: Show Business has No Business in the News Business." Broadcasting, 9 May 1977, p. 84.

"Mi\$\$fortune." The Times Delphic (Des Moines: Drake University), 14 February 1984, p. 4.

Murphy, Steve, Telephone Interview, 18 February 1984.

Notter, Rick. Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.

Novack, Michael, "Notes on the Drama of Politics and the Drama of Journalism." In The Politics of Broadcasting: The Alfred I. duPont Foundation Survey of Broadcast Journalism, 1971-2. Edited by Marvin Barrett. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1972.

Novack, Michael, "The People and the News." In Moments of Truth: The Fifth Alfred I. duPont Columbia University Survey of Broadcast Journalism. Edited by Marvin Barrett. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1973.



- O'Donnell, Michael Joseph. "Newscast Content of Six Iowa Television Stations: News Consultant-Retaining Stations versus Non-consultant Stations." Masters Thesis, Iowa State University, 1978.
- Page, Susan. "'Til Deadline Do Us Part: Conflicts for a Couple of Reporters." Washington Journalism Review, March 1985, pp. 45-48.
- Peterson, Gordon. Telephone Interview, 7 March 1985.
- Phillips, Barbara E. "Novelty without Change." Journal of Communication., Autumn 1976, p. 111.
- Powers, Ron. The Newscasters. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1977.
- Pressman, Gabe; Shayon, Robert L.; and Robert Schulman, "Ethics in Television Journalism," in Ethics and the Press, ed. John D. Merrill and Ralph D. Barney (New York: Hastings House, 1978), p. 236.
- Rather, Dan; Herskowitz, Mickey. The Camera Never Blinks: Adventures of a TV Journalist. New York: Ballantine Books, 1977.
- Rennick, Jim. Telephone Interview, 17 February 1985.
- Roberts, Churchill L.; Dickson, Sandra H. "Assessing Quality in T.V. News." Journalism Quarterly, Summer 1984, p. 392.
- Roedemeir, Gary. Telephone Interview, 15 January 1985.
- Roper Foundation. Trends in Attitudes Toward Television and Other Media: A 24-Year Review. New York: Roper Foundation Television Information Office, 1983.

Rosenburg, Howard, "Anchorwoman Beats Odds for Right to Fight Nielsen." The Rocky Mountain News, 4 February 1984, p. 88.

Rupple, Carol. Phone Interview, 19 April 1984.

Salmans, Sandra. "The Glamour Clones." The Des Moines Register, 6 May 1984, p. 4-TV.

Sanders, Keith; Pritchett, Michael. "Some Influences of Appearance on Television Newscaster Appeal." Journal of Broadcasting 15(1971):293-301.

Savitch, Jessica. Anchorwoman. New York: Putnam, 1982.

Schneider, Marlene. Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.

Schosteck, Herbert. "Factors Influencing Appeal of T.V. News Personalities." Journal of Broadcasting 18(1973-4):63-71.

Schwall, Ken. Telephone Interview, 17 March 1985.

Siebert, Fred; Peterson, Theodore; Schramm, Wilbur. Four Theories of the Press. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1956.

Sigal, Leon. Reporters and Officials: The Organization and Politics of Newsmaking. Lexington, Mass.: D.C. Heath, 1973.

Smith, Craig R. "T.V. News as Rhetoric." Western Journal of Speech Communication. Summer 1977, pp. 150-51.

Smith, Kathy. Telephone Interview, 21 January 1985.

Smith, Sally Bedell. "TV Newswoman's Suit Stirs Debate

on Values in Hiring." The New York Times,  
6 August 1983, sec. 1, p. 1.

"Statistical Package for the Social Sciences," computer  
software (Hightstown, N. J.:  
McGraw-Hill, 1983).

Stone, Vernon. "News Pays Its Way -- Or More." The  
Communicator, April 1985, p. 16.

Stone, Vernon. "Salaries Change Little in 1984." The  
Communicator. February 1985, p. 18.

Swank, Charlie. Telephone Interview, 15 November 1984.

"TV Co-Anchor Testifies about Pay," The New York Times.  
3 August 1983, sec. 3, p. 23.

Tankard, James W., et al. "Non Verbal Cues and T.V. News."  
Journal of Communication, Autumn 1977, p. 107.

Taylor, Tomi Jo. Telephone Interview, 14 November 1984.

Thompson, Gary. "Craft Sees 'Illusion' in TV News  
Business." The Times Delphic (Des Moines:  
Drake University), 14 February 1984, p. 1.

Tuchman, Gaye. "Professionalism As an Agent of  
Legitimation." Journal of Communication,  
Spring 1978, p. 109.

University of Michigan. Interviewer's Manual.  
Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1976.

Van Pelt, Abby. "T.V. News Expose! (Film at 10)."  
The Des Moines Register, 29 April 1984, pp. 2-TV.

Vissar, Peter. Telephone Interview, 14 November 1984.

Walker, Brie. Telephone Interview, 14 February 1985.

Walker, Jacquie. Telephone Interview, 31 January 1985.

Walker, Liz. Telephone Interview, 5 March 1985.

Westin, Av. Newswatch: How T.V. Decides the News.  
New York: Simon and Schuster, 1982.

"Why People Are Turned Off by Television." U.S. News  
and World Report. 13 February 1984, p. 49.

Wilson, Gaddy. "Are Newswomen Changing the News?" Ms.,  
December 1984, p. 45.

"Woman in TV Sex Bias Suit is Awarded \$500,000 by Jury."  
The New York Times, 9 August 1983, sec. 1, p. 1.

Worden, Bill. Telephone Interview, 6 February 1985.

Zewe, Charlie. Telephone Interview, 18 March 1985.

APPENDIX A

SURVEY SAMPLE

Large Markets

#38. Raleigh, North Carolina, ABC  
WRAL, News Director: Ron Price  
PO Box 12000, Raleigh, North Carolina 27605  
(919) 821-8555

    Anchors: Denise Boyer (COMPLETED 2/6)  
            Charlie Gaddy (COMPLETED 3/18)  
            no third given

#40. Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, ABC  
KOCO, News Director: Perry Box  
PO Box 14555, Oklahoma City, OK 73113  
(405) 478-3000

    Anchors: Jack Bowen (COMPLETED 1/14)  
            Jerri Harris (INCOMPLETE INTERVIEW)  
            Ron Gardner  
            Ann Nyberg  
            Ron Stall

#42. Salt Lake City, Utah, NBC  
KUTV, News Director: Michael Youngren  
2185 S. 3600 West, SLC, Utah 84119  
(801) 973-3000 (-3030)

    Anchors: Randall Carlisle  
            Michelle King (ON MATERNITY LEAVE)  
            Kathy Brock (COMPLETED 3/6)

#44. Louisville, Kentucky, CBS  
WHAS, News Director: Hal Stopfel  
PO Box 1084, Louisville, KY 40201  
(502) 582-7840

    Anchors: Gary Roedemeir (COMPLETED 1/15)  
            Jacki Hayes  
            Jim Mitchell

- #46. Norfolk/Portsmouth, ABC  
 Norfolk-Portsmouth-Newport News-Hampton, Virginia, ABC  
 WVEC, News Director: David Goldberg  
 PO Box 400 Hampton, VA 23669  
 (804) 723-4827

Anchors: Jim Kincaid  
           Jane Gardner (COMPLETED 3/18)  
           Alvita Ewell

- #48. Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, ABC  
 WHTM, News Director: Bob Janis  
 PO Box 2775, Harrisburg, PA 17105  
 (717) 236-2727

LETTER RECEIVED NOVEMBER 16, 1984: REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE

- #50. Wilkes-Barre/Scranton, Pennsylvania, ABC  
 WNEP, News Director: R. Paul Steuber  
 Wilkes-Barre/Scranton Airport, Avoca, PA 18641  
 (717) 346-7475

Anchors: Karen Harth (COMPLETED 2/6)  
           Nolan Johannis (COMPLETED 3/5)  
           Jim Rennick (COMPLETED 2/17)

- #02. Los Angeles, California, CBS  
 KABC, News Director: Mr. Terry Crofoot  
 4151 Prospect Ave, Los Angeles, CA 90027  
 (213) 668-2800

- #04. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, NBC  
 KYW, News Director: Randy Covington  
 Independence Mall East, Philadelphia, PA 19106  
 (215) 238-4700

#06. Boston, Massachusetts, NBC  
WBZ, News Director: Stan Hopkins  
1170 Soldiers Field Road, Boston, MA 02134  
(617) 787-7000

Anchors: Jack Williams (COMPLETED 1/21)  
Liz Walker (COMPLETED 3/5)  
Dave Whitman (INCOMPLETE INTERVIEW)

#08. Washington D.C, CBS  
WDVM, News Director: Dave Pierce  
4001 Brandywine Street NW  
Washington D.C, 20016  
(202) 364-3900

Anchors: Gordon Peterson (COMPLETED 3/7)  
Maureen Bunyon  
J.C. Hayward

#10. Dallas, Fort Worth, Texas, CBS  
KDFW, News Director: Wendall Harris  
400 N. Griffin, Dallas, TX 75202  
(214) 744-4000

CONTACTED NOV. 27, REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE

#12. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, NBC  
WPXI, News Director: V. Williams  
11 Television Hill, PO Box 1100, Pittsburgh, PA 15230  
(412) 237-1100

CONTACTED NOVEMBER 15, 1984; REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE

#14. Minneapolis, St. Paul, ABC  
KSTP, News Director: Dennis Herzig  
3415 University Ave. St. Paul, MN 55114  
(612) 646-5555

Anchors: Cindi Brucato (COMPLETED 2/26)  
Stan Turner  
Dennis Bounds (COMPLETED 11/10)



#16. Seattle, Washington, CBS  
KIRO, News Director: John Lippman (VP)  
2807 Third Ave, Seattle, WA 98121  
(206) 624-7077

#18. Saint Louis, Missouri, ABC  
KTVI, News Director: Ed McBride  
5915 Berthold, Ave. St. Louis, MO 63110  
(314) 647-2222

Anchors: Larry Conners (COMPLETED 1/30)  
Kim Hindrew (COMPLETED 2/6)  
Don Johnson (COMPLETED 2/16)

#20. Baltimore, Maryland, CBS  
WBFF, News Director: Ernie Boston  
3500 Parkdale, Ave. Baltimore, MD 21211  
(301) 462-4500

Anchors: Bill LeFevaere  
Bill Murphy (completed 1/15)  
George Lewis

#22. Portland, Oregon, NBC  
KGW, News Director: Reagan Ramsey  
1501 SW Jefferson St. Portland, OR 97201  
(503) 226-5000

Anchors: Kathy Smith (COMPLETED 1/21)  
Bill Lagatuta  
Cynthia Good (COMPLETED 2/16)

#24. Hartford/New Haven, Connecticut, CBS  
WFSB, News Director, VP News & Public Affairs: Dick Ahlis  
Broadcast House, 3 Constitution Plaza, Hartford, CN 06115  
(203) 728-3333

Anchors: Marlene Schneider (COMPLETED 3/18)  
Pat Sheehan  
Don Lark (COMPLETED 2/14)

## #26. San Diego, California, CBS

ABC:

KGTV, News Director: Paul Sands  
PO Box 85347, San Diego, CA 92138  
(619) 237-1010

Anchors: Michael Tuck  
Brie Walker (COMPLETED 2/14)  
Jack White

(NO CBS AFFILIATE IN SAN DIEGO WITH A NEWS DEPARTMENT)

## #28. Cincinnati, Ohio, NBC

WLWT, News Director: Tom Kuelbs  
140 W. 9th Street, Cincinnati, OH 45202  
(513) 352-5000

CONTACTED NOVEMBER 20; CALL AFTER SWEEPS

## #30. Nashville, Tennessee, NBC

WSMV, News Director: Bob Selwyn  
PO Box 4, Nashville, TN 37202  
(615) 749-2244

Anchors: Dan Miller (COMPLETED 3/18)  
Demetria Kalodimos (COMPLETED 1/14)  
Jim Travis

## #32. Buffalo, New York, CBS

WIVB, News Director: Jim Peppard  
2077 Elmwood Ave, Buffalo, NY 14207  
(716) 874-4410 or 876-7333

Anchors: Bob Koop (COMPLETED 3/18)  
Carol Jasen  
Jacquie Walker (COMPLETED 1/31)

#34. New Orleans, Louisiana, NBC  
WDSU, News Director: Larry Price  
520 Royal St. New Orleans, LA 70130  
(504) 527-0666 -0606

    Anchors: Lynne Gansar (COMPLETED 2/25)  
            Charlie Zewe (COMPLETED 3/18)  
            Anne Mulligan (12/5)

#36. Memphis, Tennessee, ABC  
WHBQ, News Director: Jack Moore  
485 S. Highland Ave, Memphis, TN 38111  
(901) 320-1313

    Anchors: Ed Craig  
            Claudia Barr (COMPLETED 3/5)  
            C.J. Beautien

Smaller Markets

#168. Clarksburg/Weston, CBS  
WDTV, News Director: Peter Vissar  
PO Box 480, 5 Television Drive, Bridgeport, WV 26330  
(304) 623-5555

    Anchors: Peter Vissar (COMPLETED 11/14)  
            Tom Christopher (COMPLETED 2/15)

#173. Jonesboro, Arkansas, CBS  
NO CBS AFFILIATE: ONLY ABC

    ABC:  
    KAIT, News Director: Becky Alison  
    PO Box 790, Jonesboro, AK 72403  
    (501) 932-4288 -4379

    Anchors: Jack Hill (COMPLETED 1/21)  
            Donna Dickson  
            Dick Clay (COMPLETED 3/18)

#178. El Centro, California, ABC  
KEYC, News Director: Trish Burich  
646 Main St. Yuma, AR 92243  
(619) 353-9990  
(KEYC IS ALSO AN AFFILIATE FOR NBC AND CBS)

    Anchors: Mark Anton (COMPLETED 2/14)  
            Tomi Jo Taylor (COMPLETED 11/14)  
            Debra Francis

#183. Jackson, Tennessee, CBS  
WBBJ, News Director: Bob Coob  
PO Box 2387 Jackson, TN 38301  
(901) 424-4515  
(NO CBS AFFILIATE; ONLY ABC)

    Anchors: Ron Nored  
            Brenda Brooks  
            Vanessa Echols

#188. Palm Springs, California, CBS  
KMIR, News Director: Paul Schaeffer  
PO Box 1506, Palm Springs, CA 92263  
(714) 568-3636  
(NO CBS AFFILIATE;  
    DREW RANDOMLY FROM TWO EXISTING AFFILIATES)

#193. Lima, Ohio, NBC  
WLIO, News Director: George Dunster  
1424 Rice Ave. PO Box 1689, Lima, OH 45805  
(419) 228-8835  
(WLIO IS ALSO AN AFFILIATE OF ABC)

    Anchors: Lisa Price (RESIGNED)  
            Cheryl Masur (REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE)  
            Elizabeth Long (COMPLETED 3/12)

#198. Zanesville, Ohio, NBC  
WHIZ, News Director: Charles Swank  
Lind Arcade Bldg, Zanesville, OH 43701  
(614) 452-5431  
(WHIZ IS THE ONLY NETWORK AFFILIATE IN ZANESVILLE)

    Anchors: Charlie Swank (COMPLETED 11/15)  
            George Hiotis  
            Mark Scott  
            Pamela Rodgers (COMPLETED 2/16)

#53. Flint, Michigan, NBC  
WJRT, News Director: John Rehrauer  
2302 Lapeer Road, Flint, MICH 48503  
(313) 233-3139

    Anchors: Bill Harris (COMPLETED 1/23)  
            Karen Gatlin  
            Liz Daily

#58. Knoxville, Tennessee, CBS  
WBIR, News Director: James Swinehart  
1513 Hutchison Ave. Knoxville, TN 37917  
(615) 637-1272 or -1702

    Anchors: Bill Williams  
            Edye Ellis  
            Ken Schwall (COMPLETED 3/17)

- #63. Fresno, California, CBS  
KFSN, News Director: Joanne Corliss  
1777 G. Street Fresno, CA 93706  
(209) 442-1170

Anchors: John Wallace (COMPLETED 2/26)  
Nancy Osborne  
Rich Rodriguez

- #68. Albuquerque, New Mexico, NBC  
KOB, News Director: Mark Slimp  
PO Box 1351, Albuquerque, NM 87103  
(505) 243-4411

- #73. Davenport, Iowa, NBC  
WOC, News Director: Jack Thompson  
805 Brady Street Davenport, IA 52808  
(319) 383-7000

CONTACTED NOVEMBER 19, 1984; REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE

- #78. Lexington, Kentucky, NBC  
WLEX, News Director: Dave Cromwell  
PO Box 1457, Lexington KY 40591  
(606) 255-4404

Anchors: Amye Brandli (COMPLETED 3/4)  
Mindy Shannon  
Bob Hale (COMPLETED 1/10/85)

- #83. Johnstown/Altoona, Pennsylvania, CBS  
WTAJ, News Director: Dave Hopkins  
Commerce Park, Altoona PA 16603  
(814) 944-2031, 944-1414

Anchors: Brandon Brooks (COMPLETED 2/15)  
Phil Bayly  
Rich Noonan

- #88. Evansville, Indiana, NBC  
WFIE, News Director: Len Wells  
1115 Mt. Auburn Rd, Evansville IN 47712  
(812) 426-1414

Anchors: David James (COMPLETED 1/16)  
Dan Katz  
Rick Notter (COMPLETED 2/17)

#93. Fort Wayne, Indiana, ABC  
WPTA, News Director: Jack Maurer (VP)  
PO Box 2121, 3401 Butler Rd. Ft. Wayne, IN 46801  
(219) 483-0584

Anchors: Keith Edwards (COMPLETED 1/21)  
Susan Alderman (COMPLETED 2/21)  
Victor Locke (COMPLETED 3/18)

#98. Lansing/Onondaga, Michigan NBC  
WILX, News Director: Ross Woodstock  
PO Box 30380, Lansing MICH 48909  
(517) 482-0721

(THERE IS NO ABC AFFILIATE IN LANSING/ONONDAGA)

Anchors: Bruce Aune (COMPLETED 3/18)  
Kathy Schmaltz (COMPLETED 2/14)  
Steve Dunn (COMPLETED 3/17)

#103. Augusta, Georgia, NBC  
WAGT, News Director: Jim Davis  
PO Box 1526, Augusta GA 30903  
(404) 722-0026

JIM DAVIS IS THE ONLY ON-AIR JOURNALIST AT WAGT;  
INTERVIEW COMPLETED 3/4

#108. Fargo, North Dakota, NBC  
KTHI, News Director: David Hoglin  
PO Box 1878, Fargo ND 58107  
(701) 237-5211

Anchors: Larry Hunter (COMPLETED 1/21)  
Diane Minor

#113. Lafayette, Louisiana, CBS  
KLFY, News Director: Maria Placer (placeur)  
PO Box 90665, Lafayette LA 70509  
(318) 981-4823  
(THERE IS NO NBC AFFILIATE IN LAFAYETTE)

#118. Joplin, Missouri/Pittsburgh, Kansas, NBC  
KSNF, News Director: Don Gross  
PO Box 1393, Joplin MO 64802  
(417) 781-2345

    Anchors: Jim Jackson (COMPLETED 3/18)  
            Vicki Kennedy (COMPLETED 1/14)  
            Tom Cummings

#123. Terre Haute, Indiana, CBS  
WTHI, News Director: Greg Baker  
918 Ohio St, Terre Haute, IN, 47808  
(812) 232-9481

    Anchors: Tom Maxwell  
            Kathy Klep  
            Greg Baker (COMPLETED 11/10)

#128. Wichita Falls, CBS  
KAUZ, News Director: Lynn Walker  
PO Box 2130, Wichita Falls, TX, 76307  
(817) 322-6957

ABC AFFILIATE IN WICHITA FALLS HAS NO NEWS DEPT.

    Anchors: Lynn Walker (COMPLETED 11/10)  
            Kay Shannon  
            Lisa Koseoglu (COMPLETED 2/17)

#133. La Crosse, Wisconsin, CBS  
WKBT, News Director: Steve Waller  
141 S. 6th St, La Crosse, WI 54601  
(608) 782-4678

    Anchors: Randy Meier (COMPLETED 2/17)  
            Paul Smith  
            Caragh O'Brien

#138. Macon, Georgia, CBS  
WMAZ, News Director: Tony Villasana  
PO Box 5008, Macon, GA 31213  
(912) 746-1313

    Anchors: Chuck Englund  
            Tina Hicks (COMPLETED 2/14)  
            Ellen Maynard (COMPLETED 2/17)



#143. Columbus/Tupelo, Mississippi, CBS  
WCBI, News Director: Dave Basinger  
PO Box 271, Columbus, MS 39701  
(601) 327-4444

CONTACTED NOVEMBER 19, 1984; REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE

#148. Ft. Smith, Arkansas, CBS  
KFSM, News Director: Fred McClure  
318 N. 13th St, Ft. Smith, AK 72901  
(501) 783-3131

          Anchors: Bur Etson  
                  Charlie Turt  
                  Mark Drury

#153. Quincy, Illinois, ABC  
WGEM, News Director: Les Sachs  
513 Hampshire, Quincy, IL 62301  
(217) 228-6600

WGEM IS ALSO AN NBC AFFILIATE

#158. Utica, New York, NBC  
WKTV, News Director: Jack Durant  
PO Box 2, Utica, NY 13503  
(315) 733-0404

          Anchors: Bill Worden (COMPLETED 2/6)  
                  Bill Carroll (COMPLETED 3/6)  
                  Sandy Arnn (COMPLETED 2/16)

#163. Hattiesburg, Mississippi, NBC  
WDAM, News Director: Bill Zortman  
PO Box 1978, Hattiesburg, MS 39401  
(601) 544-4730

LAUREL/HATTIESBURG DOES NOT HAVE A CBS AFFILIATE

          Anchors: Bill Zorlman  
                  Randy Swann  
                  Larry Johnson (COMPLETED 3/11)

APPENDIX B

STRUCTURED INTERVIEW

1. Name:
2. Station:
3. Position:
4. Where did you go to school? What kind of degree did you get?
5. How many years have you been a television journalist?
6. How many years have you been an on-air journalist?
7. What other jobs have you held?
8. What do you think of the Christine Craft case?
9. What kind of contact have you ever had with a consulting agency?
10. What do you think is the proper role for a consultant?
11. What kind of coaching have you had from your news director(s)?
12. Is it possible for on-air journalists to be themselves?
13. Are you yourself?
14. How much of your job is show business, or style, and how much is news, or content, in your opinion? (Put it in percentage form: 50-50? 40-60?)
15. If you could change the show business-news ratio, how would you?
16. What is the purpose of a local television news operation, in your opinion?
17. How have your attitudes about your on-air job changed since you first started?
18. If you could tell your audience one thing about your job -- something you don't think they understand, perhaps -- what would it be?
19. What is the ideal relationship between an on-air

journalist and the audience?

20. Are you satisfied with your career?
21. If you could change one thing about your job what would it be?
22. How important is appearance to your job?
23. How much do you worry about your appearance?
24. What effect do you think your appearance has had on your career?
25. Have you ever been promoted as a personality?
26. How do those promotions make you feel?
27. What effect does that sort of promotion have on the way you approach your job?

APPENDIX C  
EXAMPLES OF CORRESPONDENCE

February 7, 1985

Mary A. Bock  
1729 Grand #205  
Des Moines, Iowa !  
(515) 243-3067

Mr. Mark Slimp  
News Director  
PO Box 1351  
Albuquerque NM 87103

Dear Mr. Slimp:

I wrote to you last fall about some research I'm doing for my masters thesis. Through twists of fate and crossed telephone lines, I've managed to not reach you by telephone to follow up that letter. I am still plugging away at the thesis -- and I'm still hoping to interview three anchors from your staff as part of the final product.

I'm writing about anchors' reactions to consultants talent coaching, and how they feel about the issues raised by Christine Craft last year. So far, the anchors I've interviewed have had some surprising answers. Some are vehemently opposed to the use of consultants; others could care less.

I plan to submit an article about my findings to the Radio-Television News Directors Association magazine, The Communicator when I'm finished. Hopefully, it will be published so I can share the information.

Would you mind writing down the names of three of your front-line news anchors on the back of this letter? I've enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope so you can send it back to me. Later, I'll contact the people by telephone to arrange the best time for a 20-minute telephone interview. I work around your schedule and theirs in order not to disrupt the work day.

Thank you very much. I appreciate your help and support.

Sincerely,

Mary Angela Bock

February 7, 1985

Mary A. Bock  
1729 Grand #205  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309  
(515) 243-3067

Mr. Steve Ridge  
Manager, TV Consultation Div.  
Frank Magid and Associates  
One Research Center  
Marion Iowa 52302

Dear Mr. Ridge:

I am a graduate student at Drake University in Des Moines, presently working on my masters thesis. I've decided to explore the relationship between anchors and the people who coach them -- be they consultants, editors or news directors.

For the past several months, I've been interviewing anchors all over the country by telephone, using a structured interview that allows for open-ended answers. The results so far have been fascinating: some anchors depend heavily on a newsroom talent coach for guidance; others refuse to even speak to their station's consultant. I've found that the grand majority of anchors -- male and female -- are satisfied and happy with the way their jobs are going. Of course, I'm only halfway finished with my interview sample -- so my results are inconclusive.

I've also done extensive research on the existing literature, spent an afternoon with Christine Craft, and tried to keep up to date on the issues involved via Broadcasting and other trade publications.

I am writing to you now because it's time for me to discuss some of the issues with some talent coaches. Since yours is the number-one consulting firm in the country and is within a day's travel, I'd like very much to talk with some representatives of your company.

With your permission, and at your department's convenience this month, I'd like to take a road trip to Marion. Would it be at all possible to take a nickel tour of the place and perhaps take a consultant (or two) to lunch? I know I'm asking for a lot of your department's time. Please let me know what is workable.

I'll be calling you within the next couple of days to find out what can be arranged. Thank you in advance for your help. I'm hoping to publish a readable (i.e. non-academic) version of my thesis in the RTNDA Communicator when I'm finished this spring.

Thanks again.

Most Sincerely,

Mary Angela Bock



February 7, 1985

Mary A. Bock  
1729 Grand #205  
Des Moines, Iowa 50  
(515) 243-3067

Mr. Johnny Fever  
WKRP  
111 Fourth Street  
Cincinnati, OH 12345

Dear Mr. Fever:

Thank you for taking the time to be interviewed for my research. I appreciate your help -- I know your schedule is tight.

I plan to submit an article about my findings to the Radio-Television News Directors Association magazine, The Communicator when I'm finished. I hope to have it published so I can share the information.

Thanks again; I couldn't have done it without you.

Sincerely,

Mary Angela Bock

November 9, 1984

Mary A. Bock  
1729 Grand #205  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309  
(515) 243-3067

Mr. Sample  
News Director  
WWWW  
1234 Elm Street  
Samletown, ILL 54321

Dear Mr. Sample

I am a graduate student at Drake University in Des Moines Iowa. I am working on a thesis to complete my masters degree.

For my research, I am studying on-air journalists -- anchors -- and their impressions of what's often called the "show-biz" element in television news. What do the anchors believe should be the proper role of consultants, promoters and news marketing experts? And what impact have these third party advisors had on anchors's attitudes towards their careers?

Christine Craft made national headlines as she talked about her experiences with consultants. I've had the chance to interview her. Now I'm trying to find out how other television journalists feel.

I hope to conduct interviews with television journalists around the country. I've selected your station from a random sample to be part of this study. No other station in your market will be involved. With your permission, I would like to interview three of your anchors. I hope to conduct most of these interviews by telephone; each should take about a half hour.

Within the next two weeks, I will be contacting you, by telephone, to make arrangements for the interviews. I hope you're interested in participating. I appreciate your time and look forward to working with you.

Sincerely,

Mary Angela Bock

March 2, 1985  
1729 Grand #205  
Des Moines, Iowa 50309  
(515) 243-3067

Ms. Kris Hofacker  
Communication Specialists Executive Director  
Frank Magid Associates  
One Research Center  
Marion IA 50302

Dear Ms. Hofacker:

Thank you for spending time with me last week. Your hospitality went above and beyond the call of duty, and I'm very grateful. I know your schedule is tight, and so I realize what kind of dent my visit put into your day.

I plan to submit an article about my findings to the Radio-Television News Directors Association magazine, The Communicator when I'm finished. I hope to have it published so I can share the information with everyone who's helped me so far. Of course, I'll be sending a copy of the main thesis to your office as well.

Thanks again; I couldn't have done it without you.

Sincerely,

Mary Angela Bock